

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XLIV.—APRIL, 1919—NO. 174.

THE POPE AND THE WAR.¹

WHEN Pope Benedict XV. addressed his peace proposal to all of the belligerent powers in August, 1917, Secretary of State Lansing, replying in the name of our President, expressed the sentiment of the world at large when he said in his opening words:

Every heart that has not been blinded and hardened by this terrible war must be touched by this moving appeal of His Holiness the Pope, must feel the dignity and force of the humane and generous motives which prompted it, and must fervently wish that we might take the path of peace he so persuasively points out.

And yet the attitude of the Papacy, and particularly of the present Pope, towards the Great War was the object of criticism very different and sometimes contradictory, so that a criticism on one side might be successfully refuted even by the mere statement of another criticism from a different quarter. Nothing is more natural indeed than that the acts of the Holy See, so frequently criticized in times of peace, should not go unscathed in times of war, and especially during the recent struggle, whose violence and extent were perhaps unparalleled in the history of the world.

And, although these criticisms, emanating from ignorance or hate,

¹ In the preparation of this article the writer has made free and frequent use of many books, pamphlets and periodical articles which he has not seen fit to cite for that very reason. Among these are such works as G. Arnaud d'Agnel, "Benoit XV. et le conflit européen" (1 ser., 2 vols., Paris, 1916) and "Diplomaticus," "No small stir: What the Pope really said about the War" (London, 1917).

were brought against the Holy See by partisans of every nation concerned in the outcome of the war, we on this side are more familiar with the charge that in this peace proposal, as in all the rest of his conduct during the war, the Pope was in an especial manner favorable to the Central Powers. For

The time to speak was not in August, 1917. It was in August, 1914. The time to speak was when a ruthless conqueror invaded two peaceful and flourishing little States: the Catholic Kingdom of Belgium and the Catholic Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg. The time to speak was when a brutal soldiery massacred hundreds of Catholic priests and burned hundreds of defenseless cities. The time to speak was when the same conqueror deported whole populations and tore away thousands of husbands from their wives and thousands of children from their parents, and when one bold protest from Benedict XV. might have strengthened the hands of Cardinal Mercier in his heroic resistance to the tyranny of von Bissing. The time to speak was when Count Bobrinski persecuted the Catholics of Galicia and imprisoned the venerable Archbishop of Lemberg. No one then would have questioned the Pope's right to intervene. The whole world, indeed, was anxiously turning to Rome for one word which might have stopped the crimes and overawed the criminals.²

Consequently, it is no wonder that the same writer continues:

No special pleading can convince us that the Pope did not betray his solemn and sacred trust.

Nor is it any wonder that

In quarters hostile both to Germany and the Vatican it has again and again been said that, in refraining from all protest against the violation of Belgium, the invasion of Serbia and the numberless breaches of international law committed by the Teutons, Pope Benedict was obviously partial to Germany; and it was sometimes added that the Kaiser had promised to restore the temporal power of the Popes as a reward for this partisanship.³

Since these charges obtained considerable currency even in America, it may be worth while to consider briefly the attitude of the Pope towards the warring powers. Now it is manifestly impossible to refute in detail, in an article of this length, all the objections made against the policy of Benedict XV. It would take at least several volumes to do that. But it is possible to call the reader's attention to some fundamental principles which will enable him to see in its true light this policy so unjustly attacked. The attacks to which it has been subjected, when not due to bad faith, are due to a more or less erroneous conception of the Pope and his role in the world. Therefore it would be well to examine why the policy of the Pope has attained such international prominence.

² Anonymous, "The Vatican and the Germanic Peoples," in "The Contemporary Review," No. 662 (October, 1917), pp. 403-404.

³ "Current History," Vol. VII., Part 1, No. 1 (October, 1917), p. 6; cf. also Charles Johnston, "Pope Benedict's Letter and the Future of the Churches," in "The Atlantic Monthly," Vol. 120, No. 5 (November, 1917), pp. 685-686.

From the point of view of international law, is the Pope a sovereign or a subject? If the Pope were merely the Bishop of Rome, this question would be simple and easily solved. As an Italian bishop, he would be a subject of the Kingdom of Italy and the private and public, constitutional and penal laws of Italy would be applicable to him. He would not have, nay more, could not have a special international position.⁴ But he could be a subject only of Italy, upon whose soil he resides.⁵ The Pope, however, is not only the Bishop of the city of Rome; he is the Head of the Catholic Church. This dignity is not localized, it is not Italian. It is universal, it has essentially an international character. This fact was recognized by the Italians when they passed the Law of Guarantees, May 13, 1871,^{5a} which provided for the inviolability of the Pope's person, immunity of his residence, the right to send and receive diplomatic agents, and other honors and privileges usually accorded to sovereigns. The Head of the Church cannot be the subject of any nation.⁶

Is he then a sovereign? No, not in the ordinary meaning of the word. Sovereign means the supreme mandatory of a State, to whom the nation has delegated the exercise of the exclusive and absolute right to govern it according to his will and the power to represent it abroad. By whom is the Pope delegated? By the Catholic Church, which does not constitute an international person from a juridical point of view,⁷ although, as long as the temporal power of the Popes endured, as long as the Popes ruled over the Papal States, no one refused to treat the Pope as a sovereign. But if the Catholic Church is not an international person, has the Head of this great religious society this character, now that he no longer has a terrestrial domain? A negative answer would involve no contradiction, but an affirmative reply seems preferable in view of the actual position of the Sovereign Pontiff, both by the Italian Law of Guarantees and by the constant practice of civilized States. This solution seems illogical perhaps, but it is demanded by the present condition of the Christian world.⁸ The situation of the Pope, then, is unique. His sovereignty, though none the less real, is not territorial, but personal.

Although most authorities on international law agree that the Pope is not a subject, many are unwilling to admit that he is a sovereign, because he no longer possesses temporal power. For this

⁴ Henry Bonfils, "Manuel de droit international public (droit des gens)" (7th ed. revised by Paul Fauchille, Paris, 1914), No. 375, p. 238; most of the principles of international law mentioned in this article are drawn from this work.

⁵ Ibid., No. 391, p. 246.

^{5a} There is an English translation of this law in Herbert F. Wright, "The Constitutions of the States at War, 1914-1918" (Washington, 1919), pp. 347-350.

⁶ Ibid., No. 375, pp. 238-239.

⁷ Ibid., No. 155, pp. 91-92.

⁸ Ibid., No. 156, p. 92.

reason he was excluded from the two Hague Conferences, at the instigation of Italy, which, however, as stated above, considered the Pope a real sovereign. The difficulty in this case resides in the unwillingness of some to recognize the uniqueness of the Pope's position as spiritual head of Christendom. They look upon him somewhat as a deposed monarch trying to regain his kingdom. With this idea in mind, they bring forward the antipathy supposed to exist between the Pope and the Italian Government on account of the confiscation of the Papal States, the hatred supposed to exist between the Pope and the French Government on account of the latter's anti-religious acts, and on the other side the intimacy and friendship between the Pope and the German Government. And so, they say, the Pope could not help being anti-Ally.

But an *a priori* argument may be justly met with an *a priori* argument. These persons forget that the Pope, as head of a religion essentially universal, as its name implies, ought not to have allied himself with any nation or group of nations. It is his duty to be concerned with the lot of all peoples, whether they be Catholic or not, because he represents the Messiah, Who received from His Father all the nations as His heritage. The Pope therefore must resign his personal inclinations: he can be neither French nor Belgian nor German nor Austrian; he ought to be and is simply the Pope and nothing more. How many objections arise from the inability to comprehend the international character of the Pope's obligation! And since this character of the Holy See has occasioned so many objections in time of peace, how many much more serious objections will it be expected to occasion in time of war? If, therefore, the Pope, as head of a religion which embraces all the nations of the world and is destined to endure until the end of time, were to cast aside neutrality and support one nation or group of nations against their opponents, he would be like an unnatural mother, who helps one of her children slay the others; he would be imitating the anthropophagous barbarians so detestable to Christian civilization; he would be sinning against elementary justice.

Even if the Pope had been inclined to cast neutrality to the winds and take the part of one of the belligerent parties, he would be constrained not to do so by his unique title to sovereignty. Being the infallible lawgiver in matters of faith and morals, the supreme regulator of ecclesiastical discipline, the Head of the Church militant, the Pope, by the very force of circumstances, is frequently involved in the domestic concerns of certain States. These States, whether their population is wholly or only partially Catholic, cannot admit the possibility of the Pope becoming subject to any State. They cannot view with indifference the eventuality which would

place the Pope under the authority of any State, as the abandoning of neutrality would suggest, for this Power would soon become mixed up in the domestic affairs of other States. This is perhaps the reason for the Italian Law of Guarantees. And so the Pope must be completely free from subjection to any State. The physical man, of course, will have a nationality of origin, but the Vicar of Christ can be the subject of no one.⁹

But in spite of all *a priori* reasoning, some one may say by way of objection that for the very reason of the Pope's position as the spiritual head of the largest and most powerful of the Christian communities he ought to have vindicated justice and morality so terribly outraged by Germany. This he could have done either by taking sides with one group of nations against the other or by interposing his good offices as mediator. Now, it must be remembered that the Pope's position is anomalous. In one sense, he is a temporal power without a temporal kingdom, and in another sense he is head of all nations and ruler of none. As a temporal power, his fighting force is entirely negligible and would be a hindrance rather than a help in taking up the cause of one group of nations against another. As a spiritual power, however, his influence is incalculable, and it is precisely as the greatest moral force in the world that it is claimed he should have broken his neutrality by taking up the cause of the Allies. This argument, however, is its own reply. For as the greatest moral force in the world, the Pope must denounce "all injustice, on whatever side it has been committed."¹⁰ He must not approve one side exclusively, because he has spiritual subjects on both sides and because there is bound to be some injustice and wrong committed on both sides, however unintentional it may be on the part of the people themselves or of their rulers.

This being so, it might be asked why the Pope did not attempt "the best and worthiest temporal mission for the common head of the Catholic Church," as the Protestant juriconsult, Heffter, called it over fifty years ago, "the exercise of a conciliatory power between the nations in the interest of a general peace," namely, arbitration or mediation.¹¹ We have but to look to history to find numerous examples of the Pope as a matter of fact settling, upon invitation,

⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, No. 375, pp. 238-239.

¹⁰ From the allocution of His Holiness Pope Benedict XV. at the consistory of January 22, 1915, quoted by Alfred Baudrillart (ed.), "The German War and Catholicism" (Paris, 1905), p. 234.

¹¹ "The mediator gives counsel and advice, proposes solutions which those interested are free to follow; the arbiter pronounces a sentence which is imposed upon the parties at issue." Fauchille, in Bonfils, *op. cit.*, No. 944, p. 647.

disputes between nations to the general satisfaction of those concerned. Perhaps the instance which has attracted most attention until recent years is that of the intervention of Pope Alexander VI. between Spain and Portugal.¹² In 1493, serious dissensions arose between these two kingdoms on the subject of the possession of the New World discovered by Christopher Columbus. Believing that the New World was near Guinea and relying on a Bull of Pope Calixtus III., which recognized in Portugal the exclusive right of establishing colonies and of making commerce from Cape Bojador to the southern extremity of Guinea (an arbitral pronouncement accepted by Spain in 1479, at the time of the peace of Alcaçovas), the Portuguese king, Manuel, was on the point of declaring war on his neighbor, Ferdinand, when the latter with political cleverness appealed to Rome, trusting to the celebrated Cardinal Bernardine Carvajal the care of pleading his case.

After some days of examination of the matter, Alexander VI. solved the difficulty in the following manner. A first Bull, dated May 3, 1493, invests Spain under form of donation with the right of exclusive ownership over the island or territories discovered or to be discovered by Christopher Columbus in case they are not already found in possession of a Christian Power on Christmas Day, 1492, and on condition that they propagate the faith there. Besides, Spain obtained from the Holy See for these new acquisitions the privileges and favors formerly accorded to Portugal for the colonies on the west coast of Africa. Another Bull, dated May 4, 1493, has in view the exact delimitations of the domain of operation of Spain and Portugal, of their spheres of influence, and traces therein the line of demarcation. This was a hypothetical line drawn from the South Pole to the North Pole and passing one hundred leagues to the west of the most western of the Azores. All the lands situated to the east of this line were granted to Portugal, all those situated to the west to Spain. The line of demarcation created by Alexander VI. and modified by the treaty of Tordesillas (June 7, 1494), which transferred it 270 leagues more to the west, became the basis of all the negotiations and of all the conventions relating to the division of the dominations over the New World between all the colonizing powers.

Another instance of arbitration by invitation on the part of the Pope, and none the less interesting and none the less to the honor of

¹² For the circumstances which culminated in this intervention and for the text and translation of the Papal Bulls concerned, see Frances G. Davenport, "European Treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies to 1648" (Washington, Pub. No. 254 of the Carnegie Institution, 1918), pp. 9-12 and pp. 56 et seqq., and the authorities there cited.

the Holy See because of its comparative unimportance, is the curious appeal made to Pope Clement XII. in the first half of the eighteenth century to render a decision on the dissensions between the municipal council and the people of the Republic of San Marino. Victims of the difficulties of their magistrates, the inhabitants of this little State requested the intervention of the Pope, their suzerain. The fiery Cardinal Alberoni, crafty statesman though he was,¹³ instead of acting as mediator in accordance with the Pope's instructions, entered the village of San Marino with two hundred horsemen, forced the citizens to swear their loyalty to the Pope and named a governor. Clement XII., not at all satisfied with the violences of his minister, sent a commissioner to make an inquiry into the spirit and needs of the Republic, which he moreover confirmed in the enjoyment of its ancient liberties, after having solved the conflict between the governors and the governed.

A more recent instance of mediation rather than arbitration, and perhaps more relevant, because Germany was one of the nations concerned, is that in which Pope Leo XIII. was chosen as mediator by Germany and Spain to solve the question of the sovereignty of the Caroline Islands, claimed by both.¹⁴ The Berlin cabinet wished to apply to them the prescriptions of Article XXXV. of the Act of February 26, 1885 (Berlin Conference), and, in spite of Spain's possession of them for more than a century, it claimed that Spain had failed to accomplish a seizure of real and effective possession or had even altogether renounced possession of the islands, which ought therefore to be considered as *derelictae* (abandoned). The Empire had even taken actual possession of Yap Island. When Spain protested energetically, the German Chancellor made a clever political detour to avoid assured defeat.

After a serious examination of the matter, the Pope, without imposing his opinion upon the two parties, suggested a solution which was acceptable to both. This solution involved the recognition of Spain's sovereignty over the Carolines, taking into account her historical rights, but inviting her to render her occupation more effective in the future, and the grant to Germany of certain commercial privileges. The mediatorial propositions, dated October 22, 1885, and signed by Cardinal Jacobini, Secretary of State, were transmitted to the governments interested, who accepted them with a respectful acknowledgment. On December 17, Mariano Roca de Togores, Marqués de Molins, Ambassador of His Catholic Majesty

¹³ This is the same Cardinal Alberoni who was premier of Spain for a time and who proposed a scheme for international peace; see Milenko R. Vesnitch, "Le cardinal Alberoni pacifiste" (1912).

¹⁴ Bonfils, *op. cit.*, No. 942, p. 639, and No. 544, p. 380; note 2 on p. 381 gives an extensive bibliography of the affair.

before the Holy See, and Kurd von Schlözer, Minister Plenipotentiary of the King of Prussia before the Holy See, signed at Rome a diplomatic protocol, which consecrated in these words the Pontifical intervention:

Their Excellencies, etc., duly authorized to bring to a close the negotiations which the Governments of Germany and Spain, under the mediation of His Holiness the Pope accepted by them, have pursued at Berlin and Madrid on the subject of the rights that both of said Governments have acquired to the possessions of the Caroline and Palaos Islands, considering the propositions which His Holiness has made for the purpose of serving as a basis for their agreements, have put themselves in accord on the following articles conformably to the propositions of the august mediator.

An official newspaper of Berlin published at the beginning of the affair an article originating, it is claimed, from persons close to the Imperial Chancellery, wherein there is written, among other phrases to the honor of the Papacy, the following:

Germany chose the Pope not as an ordinary mediator, of whom it is asked to interpose his good offices with a view to the reconciliation of the interested parties, but as a sovereign arbiter, charged with deciding in the last resort and of solving doctrinally the questions of international law.¹⁵

If then the Holy See has been so successful in the past, why, it is asked, did not the Pope act as arbiter or mediator in the recent war? Because as a temporal power, he could not decide the points at issue between the Central Powers and the Allies unless invited by the governments in question to undertake the task and unless assured that they would abide by his decision. Not only did none of the governments extend such an invitation, but on the contrary

Neither the Allies nor the Germanic Powers are ready to listen to the peace proposals in the only spirit which would achieve the one object which His Holiness has in view—namely, a just and lasting peace.¹⁶

As a spiritual power, he could not upon his own initiative have decided the points at issue, unless he had had the material and evidence necessary for an impartial investigation of the pleas advanced by both sides. But apart from the fact that it would have been uncharitable and foolish to impose upon the millions of Catholic soldiers in the armies of the Central Powers the cruel obligation of choosing between loyalty to Church and loyalty to country, such an act would have been altogether unjust, unless it were the result of a long and careful investigation of the facts.

We in America, of course, being English-speaking and being grateful to France for her aid in securing our independence, and moreover, being much more familiar with one side of the controversy

¹⁵ It is perhaps worth noting that by a treaty of February 12, 1899, the Caroline Islands passed into the hands of Germany. See Bonfils, *op. cit.*, No. 544, p. 381.

¹⁶ Anonymous, *op. cit.*, p. 404.

—we, even before our entrance into the war, had a general conviction of the rightness of the cause of the Allies. The actual truth of this conviction was soon confirmed by evident acts of injustice against our own country and finally determined us to enter the war on our own account. But an arbiter needs not the general conviction of one side, but the general conviction of both sides; not merely this, but all the evidence and point-for-point proof that can be submitted by both sides in support of their claims. Such evidence as this is required in settling disagreements within the Church, for instance, on the validity of such-and-such a marriage, but such evidence as this would not have been forthcoming in the recent struggle, unless the governments on both sides had consented to bare the secrets of their chancelleries. And this they were not ready to do, for, as the anonymous writer quoted above has said:

It is certain that all the belligerents are still convinced that they are waging a war in self-defense, and that it is the other party which is guilty. Until this question of responsibility is settled and as long as the guilty rulers are glorying in their crimes, as long as the guilty nations remain in the grip of an evil creed, until the rulers are brought to their knees and until the people are brought to their senses, any intervention, even though it originate in the Eternal City, must necessarily be futile.¹⁷

The present Pope as a matter of fact did denounce "all injustice, on whatever side it has been committed." "To do more *to-day*," he said, "is not in the power given Us by Our Apostolic Charge."

But surely the Pope could have denounced the devastation, deportation and other atrocities committed upon Belgium? This brings our discussion down to the charge that the Pope as a matter of fact was pro-German. In other words, it is claimed that the Pope used his neutrality as a mask with which to cloak his secret desires to aid the Central Powers. Like all charges which are totally devoid of evidence, this is difficult to meet. No *positive* proof of unneutral acts committed by the Pope is forthcoming, and so recourse is had to acts of omission. Herein it seems is the best proof of the genuineness of the Pope's neutrality, for there was not a nation engaged in the war in which at least some of its citizens failed to charge the Pope with a breach of neutrality directed against themselves. Especially was he silent about Belgium and the outrages committed against its priests and people during the invasion and occupation. This is the charge, and its refutation is not far to seek, for the neutrality of the Vicar of Jesus Christ is synonymous with neither indifference nor inaction.

About five months after the beginning of hostilities, or to be precise, on January 22, 1915, Benedict XV. publicly declared in an

¹⁷ Loc. cit.

allocation addressed to the Cardinals the following unmistakable words:

Whilst not inclining to either party in the struggle, We occupy Ourselves equally on behalf of both; and at the same time We follow with anxiety and anguish the awful phases of this war, and even fear that sometimes the violence of attack exceeds all measure. We are struck with the respectful attachment to the Common Father of the faithful, an example of which is seen in regard to Our beloved people of Belgium in the letter which We recently addressed to the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines.

It might be complained that these words are vague and that they should have been more vigorous and denunciatory in character. But apart from the fact that the conventions of diplomatic intercourse require rather mild language and apart from the fact that a wholesale denunciation would forever suggest a prejudice and partiality which the spiritual Father of the world should never possess, we have but to continue reading the allocation and we find a direct entreaty to the Germans to observe the rules of justice and morality:

And We here make an appeal to the humanity of those who have crossed the frontiers of adversary nations and beseech them not to devastate invaded regions more than is strictly required by the necessities of military occupation, and what is of even greater importance, not to wound without real necessity the inhabitants in what they hold most dear, their sacred temples, the ministers of God, the rights of religion and of faith.

Here again the objection is raised that these sentiments are altogether opposite to those so intimately expressed to Louis Latapie in a private interview.¹⁸ This interview appeared on June 22, 1915, in "*La Liberté*," and purported to contain statements taken from the very lips of the Pope by the interviewer. In spite of the manifest incongruity of some of the statements attributed to the Pope, statements which were shocking from the point of view of law and justice as well as from the French nationalistic point of view, the interview itself, thanks to the bitter campaign waged by the anti-clerical press of France herself as well as of her Allies, secured an importance incommensurate with its true value. It assumed the proportions of a great event and its consequences are still felt as a source of discord in quarters otherwise friendly to the Holy See. But it was not without a happy effect, for it provoked from the Holy See public and formal declarations upon the very points of his policy concerning which doubts had arisen.

There are many reasons which compel us to attach little value to the Latapie interview. First of all, a private publication, as this was, is not to be accepted if it is found to be in contradiction to the

¹⁸ For the text of the interview and a discussion of its value, see Arnaud d'Agnel, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-218.

public and official documents of the Holy See. Between the sentiments of Benedict XV., written and signed by himself or his Secretary of State, and the sentiments heard and reproduced by a second party, there is as much difference as between a proof that is direct and sure and a proof that is indirect and always subject to some uncertainty.

Secondly, a study of the article in question reveals the character of the interviewer, with what bias he sought the interview and with what exaggeration he finally reported it. His style is that of a romancer, not that of an historian. This perhaps might be passed over in silence, if the entire composition had not such an artificial character. The stage is set and effect is sought for in the question and answers calculated to compel interest in the ordinary reader and awake in him his dormant patriotism. All of this is accomplished by a *crescendo* culminating in a question about the violation of Belgian neutrality, to which the Pope is made to make the naïve reply: "C'était sous le pontificat de Pie X." There are many other faults, which a study of the interviewer's words will disclose, but there is no room to discuss them here. Suffice it to say that, since some one had urged him to interview the Pope with the assurance that, if he promised to be a faithful interpreter, the Pope would speak for publication, Latapie reported the interview with charming modesty, saying, "Il a parlé et je suis son interprète—strictement fidèle." Perhaps after all Latapie was consciously humorous in adding these last two words as an apparent after-thought.

Moreover, the Latapie interview can inspire no confidence, because it was not subjected to the supervision it should have had. "The author," wrote Cardinal Gasparri in a letter to Monsignor Gibier, Bishop of Versailles, "made me the formal promise of publishing nothing without my explicit consent, and it was only on this condition that he secured the audience with His Holiness." The Pope himself in his letter (July 11) to the Archbishop of Paris, wrote:

We refuse all authority to M. Latapie, who reproduced in his article neither Our thought nor Our words, and who has been pleased to publish it without any revision or authorization on Our part, despite the promise he made.

The falsity of M. Latapie's article is attested by a note of denial appearing in the "Osservatore Romano" the very next day after its appearance, an interview with the Cardinal Secretary of State which appeared in the "Corriere d'Italia" on June 28, and finally by the Pope's letter mentioned above. The latter was accompanied by two documents. The first was a copy of a letter from Cardinal Gasparri to Sir Henry Howard, diplomatic representative of George V. before the Holy See, under date of July 1, in which the Cardinal

asserted that the Holy Father had by no means pronounced against the lawfulness of the British blockade of Germany and had not at all condemned it as if it were contrary to laws divine or human. The second document enclosed in the Pope's letter was a copy of a letter from the same Cardinal to M. van den Heuvel, the Belgian Minister at the Vatican. Besides stating that the Holy See had protested against the bad treatment of the Bishops of Namur and Tournai, the execution of priests and the destruction of the religious, scientific and artistic buildings of Belgium,¹⁹ the letter of the Papal Secretary of State contained the following remarkable words:

The violation of the neutrality of Belgium, carried out by Germany, on the admission of her own Chancellor, contrary to international law, was certainly one of "those injustices" which the Holy Father in his consistorial Allocution of January 22 "strongly reprobates."

The outstanding result of the Latapie interview, then, was this official condemnation by the Pope of the violation of Belgium's neutrality, a thing which no neutral nation has done officially even up to this late date, although the press of neutral nations used considerable space upon the subject. Even the German press felt that of all the nations concerned in the war it had been singled out by the Pope for reproof. For instance, on January 29, 1917, the influential "Hamburger Fremdenblatt" remarked in reference to Cardinal Gasparri's words:

The one belligerent Power against which the Vatican has officially spoken is Germany.

Perhaps this is enough to show that the neutrality of the Pope was, as a matter of fact, favorable to the Allies, or at least unfavorable to the Central Powers, but one or two more examples may be offered. On the 29th of October, 1915, the Pope, after hearing the news of the bombardment of Venice, renewed his instances before the Austrian Government to avoid the repetition of such deplorable deeds. One year later, when the open city of Padua was bombarded by the Austrian aero-squadron, the Pope sent a liberal subscription for the relief of the sufferers and at the same time expressed his reprobation of such bombardments by "whomsoever committed." Another example of apparent favor to the Allies is the Pope's successful intervention to secure the return of the victims of the Belgian deportation. All of this does not prove that the Pope was not genuinely neutral. It merely proves that no neutral could look on without protest at the evident crimes of Germany and her allies.

¹⁹ This is confirmed by the Pope's statement in a second interview granted to Laudet, Director of the "Revue Hebdomadaire," in which he said: "At the beginning of the bombardment of the Cathedral of Rheims We charged the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne to convey Our protest to the German Emperor."

On the other hand, the press of Germany, under official pressure of course, covered up its admitted injustice by maintaining that the Pope in his general policy showed an undue affection for the Allies and especially for Italy. The semi-official "*Kölnische Zeitung*" said:

To-day, in consequence of the untiring propaganda of the Allied Powers, the majority of the authoritative personages at the Vatican may be described as in full agreement with the Italian war-policy.

Another German newspaper, the "*Vossische Zeitung*," said:

It is hopeless to think of paralyzing the anti-German Romanism of the Vatican.

They based their claim upon the plausible enough inference that the Pope, being himself Italian by birth and having his relatives and many of his close advisors also Italian by birth, should rejoice in seeing the Italian arms triumphant. They forgot that the Pope cannot afford to let his personal feelings influence his policy, even if he so desired, unless, as in the present instance, upon the side where righteousness resides. Moreover, we know that the Papacy condemned the excuses, the injustice, the brutalities of the Germans, that German opinion was formed from the head down, that official Germany gave out all the news the people of Germany received, that, although the vast majority of the German people conscientiously believed they were right, they were officially misinformed with regard to the war, that, as long as these conditions obtained, a positive attitude of the Papacy against the German people would have been misunderstood and fruitless.

Then, too, the claim has even been made by the Protestant element in some of the Entente countries that there is a natural hostility between the Vatican and Italy because of the Pope's desire to regain "the patrimony of Peter." But in all his official utterances since the beginning of the war the Pope has only once directly mentioned the Roman Question, and then (November 1, 1914), merely by way of insisting upon the Vatican's extra-territoriality,

* * * moved thereto not by human interest, but by the sacredness of Our Office, in order to defend the rights and dignity of the Apostolic See.

It cannot be doubted that the Papacy still maintains its claim to some temporal sovereignty, even if it be only over a small ecclesiastical State, as the German Jesuit, Ehrle, believes would be satisfactory to the Pope.

Yet it is not necessary to suppose that Pope Benedict XV. expects, or even desires, the immediate realization of this plan; although we can hardly doubt that he would joyfully accept, not as a concession, but as a right, the restoration of his temporal authority over Saint Peter's

Patrimony. * * * But there is no immediate likelihood of this, even in its most restricted sense; nor should we suppose that a statesman so competent as Benedict XV. contemplates it, at least as a present possibility. For it is certain that in no peace which is likely to be made now would the Central Empires have the power to enforce the dismemberment of Italy.²⁰

Consequently, even if there had been any opposition, however slight, between the Pope and Italy, it would not have been advisable, even from the point of view of expediency, for the Pope to have allowed it to affect his judgment on the issues of the war.

Other objections against the Papal policy are equally fatuous and may be met the one with the other. On the one hand we were told that France is the first daughter of the Church, while on the other hand we were advised to consider the expulsion of religious by the atheistic government. Again, it was alleged that the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire with the twin rule of the Pope and the German Emperor had the Pope's approval. No account was taken here of the fact that the German Empire was emphatically Protestant and most narrowly nationalistic and that the Papacy could only work in harmony with it by transforming the Catholic Church into a German Church, manifestly an impossibility.

Even granting, for the sake of argument, that the Pope should not have remained neutral in the Great War, the doubtful advantages of his participation are greatly outweighed by the undoubted benefits of his neutrality. In the matter of organized relief for prisoners of war, his influence was second to that of no other sovereign. The exchange of prisoners no longer fit for military service was proposed by him in December, 1914, and was generally accepted. Then came the suggestion to intern invalid and wounded prisoners in neutral countries, which was likewise received with approbation and put into effect. The bettering of the condition of prisoners was next undertaken and resulted in allowing them Sunday rest and in interning in a neutral country, after eighteen months' captivity, the fathers of at least three children. Owing to certain practical difficulties, the last mentioned proposal was subject to some limitations. The opening of a bureau to make inquiries regarding missing soldiers and investigations in regard to their condition was accomplished with unprecedented success. An instance in point is the locating of Bonar Law's son by Monsignor Dolci, Apostolic Delegate at Constantinople, at the request of the Papal Secretary of State. In these and divers other ways did the Pope render service to humanity such as no other sovereign could have even hoped to do, and all this because of his strict neutrality. This fact was recognized alike by the Central Powers and the Allies, so that

²⁰ Charles Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 688.

even the Imperial Chancellor, Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg, in an address before the Reichstag, thirteenth sitting, August 19, 1915, expressed himself in the following terms:

I offer award of special gratitude to His Holiness the Pope, [bravo!] who has shown in this war an indefatigable interest in the matter of the exchange of prisoners, in many other works of philanthropy, and in their execution has earned the highest praise, and who but recently, by means of a very generous donation, has contributed to alleviate the sufferings of our people of East Prussia. [Spirited bravo!]

The Papal policy of peace, moreover, is not a matter of individual Popes. In the middle of 1899, when Queen Wilhelmina wrote to Pope Leo XIII. for his moral support to the Conference about to be held at The Hague, the latter replied in no questionable terms:

We consider that it comes especially within our province not only to lend our moral support to such enterprises, but to coöperate actively in them, for the object in question is supremely noble in its nature and intimately bound up with our August Ministry, which, through the divine Founder of the Church, and in virtue of traditions of many secular instances, has been invested with the highest possible mission, that of being a mediator of peace. In fact, the authority of the Supreme Pontiff goes beyond the boundaries of nations; it embraces all peoples, to the end of federating them in the true peace of the gospel. His action to promote the general good of humanity rises above the special interests which the chiefs of the various States have in view, and better than any one else, his authority knows how to incline toward concord peoples of diverse nature and character. History itself bears witness to all that has been done, by the influence of our predecessors, to soften the inexorable laws of war, to arrest bloody conflicts, when controversies have arisen between princes, to terminate peacefully even the most acute differences between nations, to vindicate courageously the rights of the weak against the pretensions of the strong. Even unto us, notwithstanding the abnormal condition to which we are at present reduced, it has been given to put an end to grave differences between great nations such as Germany and Spain, and this very day we hope to be able soon to establish concord between the two nations of South America which have submitted their controversy to our arbitration.²¹

About twelve years later his illustrious successor, Pius X., had occasion to touch upon the same subject in a communication addressed to the Apostolic Delegate to the United States of America, Monsignor (later Cardinal) Diomedé Falconio, in which among other things he said:

As for the remaining aspects of the matter, We recall to mind the example of so many of Our illustrious Predecessors who, when the condition of the times permitted, rendered, in this very matter also, the most signal service to the cause of humanity and to the stability of Governments; but since the present age allows Us to aid in this cause only by pious prayers to God, We, therefore, most earnestly pray to God, who knows the hearts of men and inclines them as He wills, that He may be gracious to those who are furthering peace amongst the peoples and grant

²¹ In Frederick W. Holls, "The Peace Conference at The Hague" (New York, 1900), pp. 338-340.

to the nations which with united purpose are laboring to this end that, the destruction of war and its disasters being averted, they may at length find repose in the beauty of peace.²²

But the present Pope did not need to rely solely upon tradition. That he was preëminently fit as well as willing to accept the burden of mediator if requested is indicated only too well by the fact that universal attention was upon him. There was unusual diplomatic activity at the Vatican. Protestant England and pagan Japan as well as Lutheran Germany saw fit to send diplomatic representatives there. Moreover, recourse to him was almost a social necessity during the war. From his very office, too, the Pope and his government possessed to the highest degree the necessary knowledge of the multifarious details involved and extensive practice in diplomacy. Add to this the impartiality inherent in his charge as attested by his policy of unobtrusive, though not indifferent neutrality. And yet, although in all his acts in the interest of peace the Pope did not once solicit directly or indirectly from one or the other of the belligerents an invitation to preside at the Peace Conference or even to participate in it, he never ceased to remain steadfast in his adherence to the resolution expressed in a letter written September 8, 1914, only a few days after his election:

We have firmly decided and determined to neglect nothing in our power to hasten the end of so great a calamity.

When one considers the actual results of the Peace Conference and how the honest endeavors of our own President to have the peace based upon the principles of justice and morality were defeated to some extent by the outcropping of the century-old greed for gold and lust for power, it might not be entirely out of place to give voice to the wish that the Vicar of Christ, the Prince of Peace, had been allowed at least to participate, if not to take the lead, in the negotiations of the world settlement.

HERBERT F. WRIGHT.

Washington, D. C.

²² In "The American Journal of International Law" (Vol. V., 1911), p. 215.

BROWNSON'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND TO-DAY.

BROWNSON was a well-known personality during his lifetime. He lectured extensively, and whatever he wrote, especially in his "Quarterly," was always considered worthy of attention, whether the notice it attracted was favorable or not. Hence any one that makes even a cursory study of Brownson's life and activities must feel surprise at the complete neglect into which the one-time prominent writer and thinker has now fallen. Brownson was converted to Catholicity in 1844, and from that time to his death in 1876 was always a most fervent Catholic. His ardor for the true faith can be compared in intense devotion only to his love for his native country. Just as intensely as he was a Catholic he was also an ardent American, and more than once he was forced into a position where he had to defend, as he puts it, American patriotism against "foreign" Catholics and Catholicity against "native" Americans. During Brownson's lifetime the United States passed through the greatest crisis of its existence. Brownson gave a son to the cause when the time for supreme sacrifice was at hand, and devoted all his own energy to it in his own field, as he had in fact done all his life. From the vast heap of his political writings he himself gathered the threads in order to weave them into a consistent whole. Thus appeared *The American Republic* in 1866. It contained what Brownson called the final statement of his views and was intended to supplant any previous contrary statements. The book, apparently, did not fulfill the hope he had expressed in its preface and he had to content himself with the patient resignation as to its fate hinted at in the same preface.

I.

The American Republic divides naturally into two parts, of which the first treats of government in general and the second of the United States. The first part commences with the question of the origin of government. This question, says Brownson, may be either one of fact or one of right. As a question of fact it can only be answered by history. To find out whether a certain people is a State, or a certain ruler is so by right, recourse must be had simply to the historical facts of the case. In this way the old patriarchal system will explain to us the fact of the origin of government, since it is the first known system of government; but it says nothing about the origin of the general right to govern, the philosophical basis of governmental authority. We must still ask: "Whence does government derive its right to govern? What is

the origin and ground of sovereignty"? (*American Republic.*) Many different answers have been given to this question and Brownson examines a few of them before offering a solution of his own.

In dealing with the theory of the "divine right of kings" as a basis of authority, Brownson makes short work. In fact his words have quite a modern flavor. This theory "consecrates tyranny; it makes God the accomplice of the tyrant" and gives the people no chance of redress. The contract theory of the origin of government, on the other hand, received detailed consideration as it was the most widely prevalent theory existent in democratic countries. Here, too, Brownson is quite up-to-date in repudiating the explanation that the first governmental authority arose out of the free and deliberate surrender of personal rights. It may be questioned, he declares, that a primitive state of nature, such as is assumed by the theory, ever existed. There is nothing to prove that it ever was a real state. But even if it was, how were men to pass out of a state which is their natural one? It would have entailed complete destruction of the old and a creation of the new; whereas according to our experience, Brownson concludes, it is difficult to bring about even the most gradual changes. Moreover, the contract would bind only those who had formed it; and it would therefore be of little service unless it had been unanimously decided upon. Again, and this is important for Brownson as we shall see later, the theory fails to account for the territorial jurisdiction of present governments, their right of eminent domain, their title to unoccupied lands, as the individuals who sacrificed their rights in order to form governmental authority never owned territory in the state of nature.

As this theory does not rest on a firm foundation, it lays no proper constraints on the authority it establishes. Brownson therefore claims that democracy as founded on the contract theory is in a way akin to barbarism. For barbarism regards all power as a personal and a private right, which view gives to it a despotic tendency. The form of democracy here spoken of likewise tends towards despotism, not indeed by granting universal suffrage, but by claiming the latter as a personal right, whereas it is only a political right and as such a public trust. Thus, Brownson concludes, while barbarism characteristically bases all authority on private right, civilization makes it a public trust; the one recognizes only individual persons, the other the State, or society. Any theory that considers public authority merely a creation of individual wills, giving it no further foundation than the individual pleasure, lays the foundation of unlimited power. There is nothing

to check the will of the majority; their power is supreme, despotic. Whenever, therefore, the people claim to rule "in their native right and might," we have a state of absolutism in a disguised form. And by claiming loudly that the voice of the people is the voice of God, the people recognize no higher law than themselves in religion, morals, philosophy and science. Here a difficulty would also arise in the question: Who are the sovereign people; when have we that collection of individuals which shall decide definitely how the power is to be used? Brownson concludes that State authority must rest on a firmer basis.

Viewing mankind historically, Brownson finds that at no time was there a tribe, however savage, that had not some sort of societal authority or organization. From the constancy of this fact he deduces the principle that some sort of society is natural to man, that all men are born "in society and can be born and live nowhere else." By society he means the people collectively existing with some sort of government. In the fact that such is the natural state of affairs, rests a correct basis for the authority which is necessary to safeguard the rights of the individuals and of the total organism. Society is therefore not a mere aggregation of individuals and it has rights that are not derived from the latter that stand on the same plane with the rights of the individuals. Individuals in as far as they derive their existence from God through society cannot be wholly independent of the latter, but must recognize certain obligations on their part towards the whole.

In view of some prevalent theories on the relation of the individual to society, Brownson's claims sound very modest, but his was the age of extreme individualism. In his theory Brownson sees a safeguard against despotism. Society derives the authority resting in it from God, and it can exercise this authority only as dependent on Him. Thus State authority was not created by any compact between individuals and the governing body. The authority rests in the people as such. In so far government is always and correctly by the people, the term people referring not to discrete individuals, but to some "organic people attached to a sovereign domain." It is only the people acting as an organic body that can exercise sovereign power, and not therefore a mere mob or a part of the people intriguing or conspiring against their fellow-men. And this right of the organized people Brownson bases directly on their ownership over territory. Where there is no proprietorship, he says, there is no dominion and no right to govern. Every nation is ultimately territorial. It is not the government that determines the territory, since it is by territorial limits that the solidarity of a people is determined. Individualism alone

or pure Socialism is insufficient as a basis for authority; each contains only a part of the truth. For Brownson there was not the acute question of deciding nationalities that exists to-day, and his theory was meant only to oppose the individualistic and collectivistic theories that in his opinion led logically to anarchy or despotism. To-day there are many factors besides the geographical, such as common interests, language, institutions, dispositions, that weigh, more or less according to circumstances, in judging such a question.

In the natural existence of the social community Brownson sees the proper relation of authority to the Creator and the only proper philosophical safeguard against individual or majority despotism. Governmental authority is implanted in the very nature of things as created by God. The organic people hold the power from God through the natural law and the rulers hold it from God through the people. Rulers are then responsible to God on the one hand and to the people on the other. Thus government is subject to the moral order and politics becomes "a branch of ethics—that branch which treats of the rights and duties of men in their public relations, as distinguished from their rights and duties in their private relations."

II.

The principles of government which he enunciated Brownson applied to the United States. The Civil War had brought into the foreground the theories on which our organized Government was thought to be based, and it is particularly in the light of the great struggle that Brownson discusses them. The question of prime importance, he says, is whether our Union was effected merely by a compact between individual and disconnected States, or not. For if it was, then the South had a perfect right to secede, mere compact furnishing an insufficient philosophical basis for governmental solidarity. Sovereign States are as unable to form themselves into a single sovereign State by mutual compact as are the sovereign individuals imagined by Rousseau—and on the compact theory the United States would at best be a sort of alliance. However, the very name United States points to political organization. The sovereignty rests not "in the States severally," but in the States united, just as the basis of authority rests not in the people individually but collectively. It was this power that asserted itself in the expression, "We, the people of the United States." The solidarity thus expressed of a United States depends on the manner in which the Union was effected, and the question becomes one of historical fact, of the relation of the States before the War of Independence.

Investigating the question from this standpoint Brownson finds that the Union between the Colonies and the mother country had been national, not merely personal, that in many respects the mother country treated the Colonies as one body. For this and similar claims, however, he makes no attempt to adduce evidence. Besides, he goes on, the Declaration of Independence was not made by States "severally independent." In the same way the original confederation, which was an acknowledged failure, and the articles of which had been drawn up by Congress "merely to conciliate the smaller States," was rejected by the American people. Hence it is evident historically that the American people has early been dealt with as a unit, and early gave expression to the consciousness of its solidarity.

The main determinant of such solidarity is for Brownson the geographical factor, and he therefore calls democracy based on this foundation territorial democracy. It is "the real American democracy" to which he opposes two other forms called, respectively, the personal and the humanitarian. Both of these were much advocated in the United States, but he considered them equally hostile to true civilization in as far as they were both forms of despotism. What he thought of personal democracy, or the theory that governmental authority rests on the free concession, or the creation of individual wills, has already been mentioned. Humanitarian democracy, going to another extreme, bases itself on the solidarity of all the human race and ignores all geographical divisions. The solidarity of the human race, Brownson concedes, does found social rights, but it is the territorial divisions of mankind that found the smaller societies or nations. Both of these democracies hold that the will of the people as seen in the simple majority is supreme. They forget that the will of the "organic, territorial people, not the inorganic people," must be considered. Hence they advocate the principle of overriding all opposition of minorities or of individuals and deciding all by the "irresponsible will of the majority."

Interesting is Brownson's application of the three kinds of democracy to the Civil War. The Southern States based their secession on the theory of personal, individual democracy; on the theory of mere contract between States, or between individuals, from which standpoint their secession would indeed have been unassailable. Their tendency was to disregard the social basis of government and to rest all rights and powers on the individual. On the other hand the tendency in the North was to go to the other extreme. The Abolitionists emphasized excessively the social element. They overlooked the territorial basis of government and

entirely waved aside the rights of individuals. Their minds were centered upon the solidarity of the human race as a whole and ignored anything like territorial limits. They set humanity over and above all individuals, States, governments and laws, and held that all these could be trampled under foot for the sake of this higher law. "In the name of humanity they would found a complete social despotism." The South, then, fought for individual democracy against social or humanitarian democracy, while the Government, standing for territorial integrity, upheld territorial democracy. If the South had not been pitted also against territorial democracy, it might have been victorious. It was the territorial democracy alone that won. Thus, on the one hand, the Civil War was the death-blow to personal democracy; while on the other hand, as Brownson firmly asserted, humanitarian democracy would take to itself all the credit for a victory which it really did not deserve.

The solidarity of the human race, says Brownson, "supposes unity of the race and multiplicity of individuals." The human race is divided into governments; these as a rule divide further into small and smaller groups and finally into individuals. In the United States the problem of the Union against the individual States was always a big one, which merely reached its climax in the Civil War. It was so acute because the theories of individual and humanitarian democracy had so many advocates. But the States that were added to the Union were always formed out of territory that previously belonged to the Union by right of purchase, or war or discovery. And this fact is for Brownson a strong argument for the territorial theory of democracy. He indeed mentions the solitary exception of Texas, but does not explain it. Hence, he continues, no State can rebel against the Union. It can only secede or cease to exist as a State. Since the territorial dominion of the Union is prior, the suicidal act of the State cannot abolish it. However, this brings us to the great problem that has been confronting our statesmen for all times: "How to assert union without consolidation and State rights without disintegration."

Difficult as the problem may at first seem, there is no real clash, according to Brownson, between the two sovereignties. They are not pitted against each other. The general government and the particular governments have their spheres of control outlined, which do not trespass one on the other. Each is complete in its own work, but incomplete and dependent on the other with regard to the complete work of the government. The general line dividing the two forms of government is that of the general interests of all and

of the particular interests of each. The general government cares for the public authority and rights; while the States provide for private rights and personal freedom. Against the encroachment of the States the individuals are safeguarded by further divisions. Just as there is no Union without States, so there are no States without the Union. The people are born into States, and the States into the United States. "The Union and the States are simultaneous, born together, and enter alike into the original and essential constitution of the American States." We see here the well-oiled fabric of government as so often extolled in theory by many writers besides Brownson. But events since the Civil War, especially those of the present day, have shown that in practice the question is not so easily settled. It is only necessary to ask: What will happen if a majority, however small, comes to hold that all matters, even those hitherto considered most supreme and inalienable rights of the individual conscience, are matters of governmental concern which vitally affect the welfare of the general community? Brownson gave as a basis the territorial solidarity of a people and considered the will of the people as a whole to be the deciding voice of power, so that a majority could not overlook the wills of the minority. With perfect human nature, this condition might be approachable. Outside of that, the least we would have to have is proportional representation. And upon this Brownson would probably not have looked with favor on account of the danger of thereby weakening if not destroying authoritative power.

Brownson disregards the idea of an encroachment on the liberties of the people by the central government for the reason that personal rights and freedom are in charge of the individual States. He sees simply a division between two coördinate governments, not a system of checks and balances in our country. A system of checks is for him a system of distrust of power, merely an "antagonism of interests that tend to neutralize each other," and it is desirable only when the object to be obtained is to have as little power as possible. Hence it cannot be the source of continued political life in the United States. Just as little does Brownson place his hope in the written constitution of our government. The latter is really extrinsic to the nation, not "inherent and living in it"; it is easily changed and in fact presupposes a power already existing. It therefore does not create power, but is itself made by a constituted authority. Hence Brownson recognizes a twofold constitution in the United States, or rather two constitutions. Below and above the written document is the constitution of the people as a whole, the spirit of the nation. This constitution is the inborn character of a nation, and varies with different nations. It gives to the people of any territory its political

existence and personality. In this Brownson ultimately places all his hopes for right government. The written constitution is merely the agency or ministry prompted by the general constitution "for the management of its affairs, and the letter of instructions according to which the agent or minister is to act and conduct the matters intrusted to him."

In placing the salvation of governmental conduct in this general constitution of the people Brownson voices an opinion that is to-day receiving an emphasis everywhere. It has never been recognized so keenly as at present that the ultimate hopes of a democracy lie in the temper and the character and the knowledge of the individuals that make up the democracy. If these are deficient in the individuals, no paper constitutions or representative systems are a guarantee against all the defects that can be found in the most despotic forms of government.

The doctrine of individual freedom in the State, says Brownson, is a product of the Christian religion, which has ever upheld the worth and dignity of each individual soul and the responsibility of each soul before God for its actions. If this is not kept in mind, the steps taken by any people collectively may be just as perverted as those of any majority or individual. The representatives of the people are accountable to God for their actions, and they are accountable to the people as a whole for the power entrusted to them. And the people collectively, in whom the authority was vested by the Creator, are also accountable to Him for their use or abuse of it. If a nation itself is wrong, Brownson emphasizes, no physical force can coerce it or turn it on the right path. For true wisdom and justice the State must ultimately rest on moral guarantees. Thus alone will there be a proper safeguard against tyranny and oppression. The responsibility of power both on the part of the entrusted civil rulers and on the part of the people must be considered a matter of conscience. True freedom will be possible only when authority protects against license and against despotism. For this two things are necessary, stability and movement. The latter element is the human and the former is made possible only by a recognition of the divine.

III.

One more question remains: What prospects did Brownson have for the future of the United States? While he recognized dangers ahead for his beloved country, Brownson's vision into the future was distinctly one of hopefulness. Since 1825 the tendency of the people had been, says he, to part more and more from the viewpoint of a territorial democracy and to adopt that of individual or personal

democracy. With the end of the Civil War—when *The American Republic* was written—a quick turn had been accomplished mainly through the war. The war had tended strongly to increase the centralizing powers of the government, and the tendency towards centralization would probably go on for some time as a reaction against secession. But when things had settled down, Brownson thought, the instinct of self-preservation would be again asserted by all the States which would be upheld in their claims by the United States judiciary. In fact, as he saw it, the individual States would be stronger to protect themselves against centralization than the central government had been to protect itself against secession. In general there was little danger to be feared henceforth from any egotistic democrats. But the humanitarian democrats would hardly rest after their supposed victory. Besides, they had in their humanitarianism the semblance of “a broader and deeper foundation, of being more Christian, more philosophic, more generous and philanthropic.” Satan himself persuades that humanitarianism is Christianity, and that the “sentiment of philanthropy is real Christian charity.” This veil of vague generality which the humanitarian casts over things is dangerous because of the plausible virtue it has, but it really “sacrifices the rights of men in a fain endeavor to secure the rights of man.”

Brownson's forecast of the growth of humanitarianism was that of a far-seeing eye. Not less prognostic was this sentence, otherwise not developed: “* * * it is not difficult to see that the mercantile and manufacturing interest, combined with the moneyed interest, is henceforth to predominate.” The mercantile interests, the moneyed barons, have predominated, and they have only too often blinded the eyes of spectators by casting over themselves the veil of humanitarianism. In the past the latter was partly a tool or weapon of theirs. To-day the humanitarians point to individual moneyed interests as the baneful results of selfish individualism. The moneyed interests and humanitarianism are now antagonists except where humanitarianism can reverse the tables of the past and use the moneyed interests as its tools. At all events, the hey-day of humanitarian democracy seems to have arrived. And the old principles of individual liberty were never more menaced than at present. Already prohibition has been constitutionalized. Of course the question was brought up as a moral one, according to the humanitarian standard, in which the individual had no rights over humanity as such, and had to be legislated into perfection for the common good. What should be only a last resource, an extreme move, is openly proclaimed only a starting point. The significance of the new measure lies in the fact that the individual

is no longer free to initiate his own moral advance, that there was no attempt or proposal made simply to safeguard against the apparent and gross abuses of the liquor trade, and in the fact that the barest majority, if any at all, could force its will on its vigorously remonstrating fellow-citizens. Already we have the same humanitarian forces at work on the tobacco question, and there is propaganda to bring about legislation to enforce, not merely to legalize, birth control. Rumbings are also heard to the effect that institutional churches are opposed to, and can no longer be tolerated by democracy—humanitarian democracy, of course. Whither is the balance of power shifting? Who are the enlightened saviors of democracy who dare thus to pervert that name? Again, we hear the thundering of voices that seek the overthrow of all power, that seek to antagonize all authority and seem to be making for complete anarchy. Truly there is still a mission before our glorious country, and a mission that can well be expressed in Brownson's words as having for its object "to realize that philosophical division of the powers of government which distinguishes it from both imperial and democratic centralism on the one hand, and on the other from the checks and balances of organized antagonisms which seek to preserve liberty by obstructing the exercise of power."

VIRGIL G. MICHEL, O. S. B.

THE SYMPHONY OF THE HOURS.

PART II.—THE PASSION OF CHRIST IN THE "LITTLE HOURS."

IN AN exquisite sermonette on the words, "Columba mea in foraminibus petrae, in cavernis maceriae" (Cant. II.), St. Bernard recalls how the Church, "in the period of her pilgrimage here on earth, has two well-springs of consolation: she may look back or look ahead; in the one case, it is the memory of the Passion of Christ which consoles; in the other, it is the thought of her future participation in the lot of the saints in light. The two thoughts stand in the relation of cause and effect. Attentively she fixes her gaze on them, and equally, whether she contemplates cause or effect, she finds a refuge from every ill and solace in every grief. Moreover, the element of certainty attaches to her joyous expectations, because they are founded on the death of Christ. How indeed could one fear or hesitate about the greatness of future reward when one reflects on the priceless ransom paid for it. 'Columba mea in foraminibus petrae!' How willingly and lovingly the soul peers into the 'clefts of the rock' from which the redeeming blood of Christ has poured in torrents: how willingly and lovingly it wanders in thought across the blue vault of heaven and contemplates the 'many mansions of the Father's house'—the future abodes of His adopted sons. * * *

This short passage is valuable to us, because it shows how very easily we can link up the "Little Hours" with the Lauds preceding. From *Prime* to *None*, all through the week, the paramount theme would appear to be the Passion of Christ—the foundation of all our hopes, the cause and pledge of our future glory. After rising in spirit to the contemplation of the *Lumen gloriae* in Lauds,¹ the soul now prayerfully turns its gaze to the "clefts in the rock"; it lives for the time being in an atmosphere of the Passion; so that the recitation of this part of the Office may be regarded as a DAILY TRIBUTE OF DEVOTION TO THE PASSION OF CHRIST. The idea of associating the Little Hours with the Passion is not altogether new. The old recognized authorities on the Office are full of happy thoughts on their mystical significance, in virtue of which the various stages or scenes of the tragedy of the first Good Friday are lived over again in the sequence of the hours. *Prime* is the hour, for instance, when our Divine Saviour was mocked, spit upon, struck, bound. *Terce* recalls more trials, the "crucifigatur," the sentence and the carrying of the Cross; *Sext* will bring to mind the crucifixion and the darkness that was over the whole earth, and *None* must always be associated with the last act of the great tragedy.

¹Cfr. "Catholic Quarterly Review," 1918: "The Symphony of the Hours."

When the Little Hours were confined practically to one psalm (cxviii.), these extrinsic and sometimes arbitrary associations served to secure variety of devotional thought, where there was the ever-present danger of monotony, and there is no reason to discard them altogether even now, when variety is assured by the psalmody itself. On the contrary, there often exists, whether intentionally or not, a happy coincidence between the newly chosen psalms and the old devotional suggestions, but our present endeavor, for simplicity's sake, will be to confine our study to only one devotional channel—the one in which the new psalmody can be made to run most smoothly, and that undoubtedly is the Sacred Passion. The utility of this aspect of the Little Hours is accentuated when we come to link them up with the morning Mass, “in quo recolitur memoria Passionis ejus.” In an ordinary day's routine, *Prime* is the first instalment of prayer after the “Actio gratiarum,” of which one of the most beautiful specially indulgenced prayers is the “Obsecro.” There the priest is made to feel the need and importance of the Passion of Christ as his daily food and support. He prays “ut Passio tua sit mihi virtus qua muniar. * * * Vulnera tua sit mihi cibus potusque. * * * Aspersio sanguinis tui sit mihi ablutio omnium delictorum. * * *”

It is no small devotional gain to be able to take up this golden thread of prayer where the thanksgiving after Mass left it, and so to regard the Little Hours as a welcome renewal, an expansion and development of the soul's grateful outpouring after the morning Sacrifice. For, as St. Bernard writes: “Nos vero, si vere spirituales apes sumus, de floribus nostri paradisi Nazareni, id est horti florentis floridissimi Christi nobis *memoriam componamus tenacem*, quae non qualibet tentatione dissolvatur, sed apta sit illa memoria recipere impressionem sigilli, id est crucifixi Jesu: ut illum *semper in memoria* habeamus qui dicit. Pone me sicut signaculum. * * * Colli-gamus ergo nobis in floribus vitis nostrae Domini Jesu talem *memoriam*, talem delectationem; ut stigmata Crucifixi nostri *in memoria jugiter* retinentes, ita in ipso, qui solus est dulcis, delectemur; ut omnes per ipsum praesentis vitae amaritudines superemus, mundemur ab omni delicto et in bonis operibus jugiter * * * conservemur” (St. Bernard, *Vitis mystica*, c. 44).

The priest lives, as it were, in an atmosphere of the Passion; it enters into all the ramifications of his life: it is at all times his consolation and support, the solvent of every sorrow, the laver of daily regeneration, the pledge of perseverance. It is for the memory to hold it fast, as St. Bernard urges above; to receive and retain the indelible impression of the stigmata as of a seal, clear-cut and deep (“Christo igitur passo in carne, et vos in eadem cogitatione arma-

mini"—I. Pet. iv., 1). With St. Bernard he will pray: "Cruci confige manus meas et pedes meos; et totum Passioni tue conforma servum tuum. Illam, inquam, divinissimam crucem humeris meis impone, cujus latitudo est caritas, cujus longitudo est aeternitas, cujus sublimitas est omnipotentia, cujus profundum est inscrutabilis sapientia" (Med. in Pass. Dni.). With a due sense of the importance of almost habitual meditation on the Passion of Christ, and having pointed out a certain extrinsic connection which it has with the Little Hours, we may turn now to see how admirably the psalms themselves suggest the same solemn theme.

FERIA II.

Prime. Ps. xxiii.: "Domine est terra"; Ps. xviii.: "Coeli enarrant."

Terce. Ps. xxvi.: "Dominus illuminatio mea"; Ps. xxvii.: "Ad te Domine clamabo."

Sext. Ps. xxx.: "In te Domine Speravi."

None. Ps. xxxi.: "Beati quorum"; Ps. xxxii.: "Exultate justi."

First come by way of introduction and transition "two songs of the Creation," "Domini est terra" and "Coeli enarrant," summing up, as it were, the glories of Lauds. They serve on Monday as a connecting link between the glorious mysteries embodied in Lauds and the sorrowful mysteries that follow in this "psalmodic rosary." Then the shadows begin to lengthen ("Delicta quis intelligit"), darkness comes on apace; there are indications of an oncoming storm, of a conflict in which Christ Himself is eventually to be the protagonist. This is the burden of the "Dominus illuminatio mea" (in two portions), which introduces Monday *Terce*.

It has been suggested (cfr. Haydock, note) that this psalm was composed when the people dissuaded David from going into battle (II. Kings xxi., 17), an incident which easily brings to mind the occasion when Peter would dissuade his Master from going into the danger He had just spoken of, viz.: "that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the ancients * * * and be killed" (Mark viii., 31). However this be, the psalmist is clearly in great distress, abandoned by men, sorely afflicted and calumniated. He is without a home, an exile in a foreign land, abandoned and driven away from the place of the sanctuary. And so with Christ: His enemies are closing in; "appropiant super me nocentes ut edant carnes meas * * * insurrexerunt in me testes iniqui"; the false witnesses in the judgment hall are brought into the picture: "mentita est iniquitas sibi"; and His complete abandonment is recalled, "quoniam pater meus et mater mea dereliquerunt me." He stood before His accusers alone: but God was with Him, "Dominus assumpsit me * * * quem timebo." As the sun pierces the

mists or breaks through a mass of gloomy threatening clouds, so the feeling of security and joy effectually dispels the oppressive darkness of every kind of tribulation or persecution.

The next psalm, the "Ad te Domine clamabo," follows on as a most suitable pendant to the foregoing. The fathers understand it of Christ suffering (Note, Haydock), and there are reasons to suppose that it was composed when holy David was sorely tried by the afflictions brought upon him by his rebellious son, Absalom. It is another of those "songs in the night" which will meet us frequently in the course of the Little Hours. The thorn at the breast of the nightingale was thought by the old naturalist to make it sing, and certainly David's griefs made him eloquent in holy psalmody. He plumbs the deepest depths of sorrow, and therefore it is that he brings us so near to the Sacred Heart of our Divine Saviour in His Sacred Passion. Like Isaias, he is an evangelist of the sufferings of Christ, and the pleading petitions so frequently to be met with furnish not merely a passing glimpse, but often enough a true and searching analysis of the internal Passion. It is noteworthy that this psalm had a place in the Matins of the feast which formerly appeared in the calendar, commemorating the "Prayer in the Garden," so this may well be in our thoughts when we meet the psalm in the course of the Little Hours: "Father, if it be possible." "In the days of His flesh," the Eternal High Priest "with a strong cry and tears, offering up prayers and supplications to Him that was able to save Him from death, was heard for his reverence" (Heb. v. 7). Even so his prototype, the royal psalmist, in deepest anguish of soul, utters his strong and pleading cry: * * * "Deus meus, ne sileas a me, ne quando taceas a me et assimilabor descendentibus in lacum." It is a matter of life and death that God should hear and answer, for it was regarded as a great calamity and presage of evil if God was silent whenever high priest or prophet or king consulted Him in the Holy Place. In this psalm, therefore, we may well picture our Divine Saviour waiting in the Garden of Gethsemane with heaviness of heart, for the Father's response to His repeated prayer, "exaudi Domine vocem deprecationis meae."

The second part of the psalm is the happy sequel, for "There appeared to Him an angel from heaven, strengthening Him" ("Benedictus Dominus, quoniam exaudivit"); and in virtue of that divine reassurance, He can live again: "Refloruit care mea * * * benedictus Dominus quoniam exaudivit vocem meam. * * * Dominus adjutor meus et protector meus."

At *Sext* we find psalm xxx, "inte Domine speravi," divided into three sections. It will always stand out with special prominence as one of the two psalms from which our dying Saviour quoted as He

hung upon the Cross: "In manus tuas commendo spiritum meum" (verse 6.) Some commentators suggest that Christ may perhaps be the subject of the whole psalm. Certainly several of the verses are like literal descriptions of some of the episodes of the Passion: "I am become a reproach among all My enemies, and very much to My neighbors; and a fear to My acquaintance: they that saw Me without fled from Me. * * * I am become as a vessel that is destroyed: * * * while they assembled together against Me, they consulted to take away My life. * * * My strength is weakened and My bones are disturbed" (verses 11-14); and verse 23 will easily suggest thoughts of the agony in the Garden: "I said in the excess of My mind, I am cast from before Thy eyes. Therefore Thou hast heard the voice of My prayer when I cried to Thee." In the Liturgy this psalm is drawn upon at Passiontide, on Friday and Saturday in Passion Week, verses 2, 10, 16, 17 forming the Introit of the Mass. It is a psalm of mingled measures, of alternate undulating strains, falling into valleys of mourning and rising to the higher ground of confidence, from which the inspired singer takes a rapid survey of his life as of a landscape unfolding before his eyes; and dark shadows notwithstanding, he must perforce exclaim: "Quam magna multitudo dulcedinis tue, Domine." The three sections into which the psalm falls in *Sext* are three formal divisions:

I. The psalmist prays God to be gracious to him in his trouble, expressing at the same time his trust in Him who in times past had been his deliverer.

II. He pours out before God the story of his sufferings and his sorrows, beseeching Him again to let the light of His countenance shine upon him and to put his enemies to shame.

III. He concludes with praise and thanksgiving to God for His goodness to all who trust in Him, and particularly to himself, and calls upon all the saints to love the Lord, to act manfully in the day of trouble. No special effort will be required when saying Office to associate these sublime sentiments with the Via Crucis: "Propter nomen tuum deduces me et enutries me." I shall require Thy sustaining hand all along that painful journey that will terminate with My death; I shall be faint with loss of blood and often shall I fall beneath the heavy burden of the Cross; but Thy hand will lead Me, and for Thy name's sake because Thou art the God of justice and truth, and because of Thy promises "Thou wilt nourish Me." The first section in the main will fit in best with the thought of Christ's anguish of soul: "He began to grow heavy and to be sad" * * * and He said to them: "My soul is sorrowful even unto death." The second section, beginning with the words, "Miserere mei Domine,

quoniam tribulor," tells rather of physical suffering: "Conturbata est * * * oculus meus, anima mea et venter meus * * * infirmata est virtus mea et ossa mea conturbata sunt." Body as well as soul felt the effects of His great sorrow, which indeed penetrated to every part and looked like compassing His destruction: "Factus sum tanquam vas perditum"—a truly forceful and accurate summing up of the ignominy and dereliction of the Man of Sorrows—"a broken vessel good for nothing, of which no further use can be made, which cannot be made whole again, for which no one cares, and the fragments of which are thrown away." It would almost seem that heaven, too, had entered into league with the powers of darkness, so much so that "I said in the excess of My mind, 'I am cast away from before Thy eyes,' " but this is only a vivid way of expressing the acute intensity of the conflict, the presence of two opposing elements within the narrow precincts of the soul—grief oppressing, hope upholding; the darkness of dismay encountered by the light of faith; the demon of despond being slowly strangled in the powerful grip of God's mercy: "Quoniam mirificavit misericordiam suam mihi in civitate munita." Behold! just because of My extreme affliction, which was nearly depriving Me of all courage and confidence, nay, of understanding—"Ideo exaudisti vocem orationis mee."

None brings two psalms (xxxix.), "Beati quorum" and the "Exultate justi" (xxxix.), in two sections. Both of them on examination will be found to fit into our scheme of meditation on the Passion and death of Christ, inasmuch as they point to the blessings that flow from the Cross. At the hour of *None* we take our stand in spirit at the foot of the Cross. The words of the prophet Isaias will come back to us: "You shall draw water with joy from the fountains of the Saviour" (xli., 3). There can be no joy, no forgiveness, no glory save in the Cross of Christ, as St. Paul argues in the well-known passage, where he quotes the first verse of Psalm xxxix.: "To him that worketh not, yet believeth in Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reputed to justice according to the purpose of the grace of God." As David also termeth the blessedness of a man to whom God reputeth justice without works. "*Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin.*" And the meritorious cause of all this imputed justice with its consequent blessedness is stated at the end of the chapter, even "Jesus Christ our Lord, who was raised from the dead, who was delivered up for our sins and rose again for our justification" (Rom. iv.). It may be remarked that this is the second psalm beginning with the word "Blessed." In the first we have the blessing of innocence, "Beatus

vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum, etc.," but here we have the blessing of repentance as the next happiest state to that of sinlessness, also the blessing of being liberated through the merits of the Cross from the stain and guilt of original sin, because the fathers explain this psalm in reference to the grace we receive in baptism and penance. Here again St. Paul helps us to keep well in mind the Passion and death of Christ, for the very rite of baptism is of itself an object lesson. "Know you not that all we who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized in His death? For we are buried together with Him by baptism into death. * * * Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin may be destroyed" (Rom. vi.). Baptism, therefore, which draws all its efficacy from the sacrifice of the Cross, gives the soul its first experience of the happiness extolled by the psalmist in the words of the second verse, "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin, and in whose spirit there is no guile," that is to say, the merits of the Cross energize with their twofold effect—original sin is blotted out and concurrently there is given the first instalment of sanctifying grace. How joyously should the priest, as he recites or chants this psalm, welcome this reminder of what the atoning sacrifice of Calvary did for him at the outset of his soul's supernatural life.

The leading thought, however, is the forgiveness of actual sin: "Tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei." Notice the vivid description of the dire effects of sin: "Because I was silent, my bones grew old; whilst I cried out all the day long. For day and night Thy hand was heavy upon me: I am turned in my anguish, whilst the thorn is fastened." Obviously these words will recall something of Our Divine Saviour's sufferings, when sin was allowed to wreak its fury on His own Sacred Person. Because He made Himself a vicarious victim, the scourge was His, the thorns were His: "Multa flagella peccatoris * * * conversus sum in aerumna, dum configitur spina"—and the "copiosa redemptio" was ours. And as Christ in His agony betook Himself to His Heavenly Father we also may turn to Him with the words (verse 7), "Tu es refugium meum a tribulatione quae circumdedit me," with every assurance that our confidence is not misplaced: "quia firmabo super te oculos meos." Wherefore "Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice ye just," for as St. John writes (I. Ep. i., 9): "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all iniquity * * * the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Psalm xxxii. is a continuation of the former, with the last verse of which it may be well connected: "Rejoice in the Lord all ye just." It is clearly a pæan of victory; and though it may be, as some have conjectured, that it was composed by David after he had been

rescued from the giant Jesbibnebob (II. Kings xxi., 16), "The king is not saved by a great army: nor shall the giant be saved by his own great strength" (verse 16). The application here will be to Christ's victory over the arch-enemy of the human race; the giant whose power seemed almost irresistible. But "the Lord bringeth to nought the counsels of nations and He rejecteth the devices of the people and casteth away the counsels of princes" (verse 10). Craft and cunning, sophistry and all false philosophies must eventually yield to the power of the Cross. "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? * * * the word of the Cross * * * is the power of God" (I. Cor. i., 20). So also the might of this world must needs go down before the will of God: "De coelo respexit Dominus; vidit omnes filios hominum," and not merely from His throne of majesty in light inaccessible, but from the wood of the Cross when the mantle of darkness was thrown round Calvary's height: "From His habitation which He hath prepared, He hath looked upon all that dwell on the earth" (verse 14); that is to say, He recognized the innate weakness of the race, and He saw that "no one by his own merits or exertions could be delivered from the evils that surround us on all sides; that we all need the mercy of God" (Bell), and it is from the pulpit of the Cross that this sound has gone forth over the whole earth. "Vain is the horse for safety, neither shall he be saved in the abundance of his strength." Our only abiding strength is in the merits of Christ crucified. Sennacherib with all his cavalry was not a match for one angel of the Lord, Pharaoh's horses and chariots found it vain to pursue the Lord's anointed, and so shall all the leaguered might of earth and hell find itself utterly defeated when confronted by the standard raised on Calvary's height. * * * "Qui salutem humani generis in ligno crucis constituisti; ut unde mors oriebatur, inde vita resurgeret; et qui in ligno vincebat, in ligno quoque vinceretur." O mors, unde mortui reviviscunt (St. Aug.). The eyes of God's searching Providence are "on them that fear Him and on them that hope in His mercy; to deliver their souls from death; and feed them in famine," words of comfort, which taken in their spiritual sense, constitute a concise statement of all that Christ effected in the course of His Sacred Passion and death. "My flesh is meat indeed, My blood is drink indeed." There can be no "famine" or "death" in the spiritual order, for "the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord. * * * He is our helper and protector," and when we recall all that He has done for us, suffered for us, and wrought for us by His redeeming blood, "our heart shall rejoice," we shall "sing to Him a new canticle, 'Exultate * * * Fiat misericordia tua Domine super nos; quemadmodum speravimus in te.'"

TUESDAY.

Prime. Ps. xxiv.: "Ad te levavi"—three sections.

Terce. Ps. xxxix.: "Expectans expectavi"—three sections.

Sext. Ps. xl.: "Beatus qui intelligit"; xli.: "Quemadmodum desiderat"—two sections.

None. Ps. xliii.: "Deus auribus nostris"—three sections.

The subject matter of our first psalm has been well described in one simple phrase, "the gazing up at eternal mercy." The devout soul has taken up a position at the foot of the Cross, on which her Spouse and Redeemer hangs twixt heaven and earth; the prophetic words of Christ come back to memory with a force all their own: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself. Now this He said, signifying what death He should die" (John xii., 33), and in loving response the soul begins her meditation with the words, "Ad te Domine levavi animam meam": she will ask to have her share in the Great Sacrifice, which surely the one word "levavi" will recall. The sacrifices of the Old Law were but figures of the One Sacrifice to come, and constantly do we find this expression connected with them. For example, in Leviticus viii., 27, when the "oblation of consecration" was delivered to Aaron and his sons, we have the official phrase, "Who having *lifted* them up before the Lord"; again (xiv., 24), "and the priest receiving the lamb and the sextary of oil shall *elevate* them together," and in I. Par. xvi., 29, "Levate sacrificium et venite in conspectu." Thus the very opening words of the psalm at *Prime* on the FERIA tertia strike the chord with which the "Passion music" begins and continues through the Little Hours for this day. David depicts his abjection in words which will not fail to suggest the still greater sorrows of the future "Root of Jesse." "The troubles of my heart are multiplied. * * * I am alone and poor. See my abjection and labor, consider my enemies, for they are multiplied, and have hated me with an unjust hatred. * * * Look thou upon me and have mercy on me * * * neither let my enemies laugh at me." And corresponding to the group of faithful ones at the foot of the Cross: "Stabant juxta crucem," a similar flash of consolation pierces the darkness in which the psalmist has almost lost his way: "The innocent and the upright have adhered to me, because I have waited on Thee. * * * Keep Thou my soul and deliver me."

It is never safe to dogmatize about the historical occasions of the psalms, but oftentimes the conjectures that are thrown out in this regard, as has been done twice already, will be found to be devotionally helpful. Here, for instance, there is nothing inherently

improbable in supposing that David had in mind the particular sorrows he felt through the waywardness and ingratitude of his son Absalom. The psalm seems to have been composed in his later life, for he prays (verse 7), "*Delicta juventutis meae et ignorantias meas ne memineris*," and as we have noticed already, he was deserted by all but a few—too slender a framework certainly on which to hang critical exegesis, but sufficiently strong to bear the lighter weight of a composition of place. It is so difficult to say the Office with carefully maintained attention that piety will be ready to welcome every reasonable means of securing it, or at least minimizing the tendency to mind-wandering, and the imagination is often set working in a devotional channel by circumstances extrinsically connected with the composition of a psalm, rather than with the psalm itself, which is not always quite easy to understand. And so here, as indeed in most of the psalms of the Little Hours. It matters not to the general intention of reciting the Office "*attente ac devote*" whether David is pouring out his grief under the persecuting hand of Saul or under the smart of a son's ingratitude, or whether one prefers to apply these melodious laments to the heart-broken captives in exile, they all serve in turn as adventitious aids to the one great and all-absorbing devotion of the Passion of Christ. All the main roads in the Old Testament lead eventually to Calvary; it is only a question of deciphering the finger-posts. The afflictions of David, for example, in connection with Absalom's revolt, help us to grasp much more vividly the element of ingratitude in sin on the part of the sinner, and the correlative feature of fatherly forbearance on the side of God, "for the Spirit Himself giveth testimony that we are the sons of God" (Rom. viii., 16). The Passion of Christ becomes a much more personal appeal to us, not exactly because these details of time and circumstance tell us anything new about our Divine Saviour, but because, like the parable of the Prodigal Son, they stimulate the imagination and at once create an atmosphere in which prayer thrives and moves about with healthy and well-sustained vigor. In this particular instance, *e. g.*, we feel how deeply David must have grieved that his own son should have come out against him as a mortal enemy. His heart bled and he shed bitter tears when he thought of the ingratitude and impiety of his child, the faithlessness of his people and the misery which should come upon them as the result of rebellion. These are but a portrait in miniature of the world's sin and the misery consequent on it, and with that portrait well in mind, there will be no difficulty in recognizing the features of the original when limned for us in the prophetic utterances of the psalmist, and the Church helps us to do this especially in the penitential season of Lent, when the "harp

ceases its notes of joy and the daughter of Sion, the Bride of Christ, weeps and mourns over the desolation and horror caused by sin, both in her Spouse, the Crucified One, and in the hearts of sinners. Hence, verses taken from our psalm are entwined, like purple wreaths of passion flowers, around the monuments of divine justice and mercy, as shown us in the Epistles and Gospels of that liturgical period" (Roche, *Psallite sapienter*, p. 426). There is every reason, therefore, why our thoughts should travel in the course of this psalm to the foot of the Cross, where we deposit our burden of sin, where we recognize that our sin is aggravated by the fact that we are the "Sons of God," and that we are guilty not merely of treason against a Sovereign, but like Absalom, of the still more heinous crime of ingratitude towards a Father, where we find the load of our iniquity, heavy though it is, shouldered by another "who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the Cross"; where, in fine, "mindful of the mercies that are from the beginning of the world," we are buoyed up day by day with the assurance of pardon.

At *Terce* we have psalm xxxix, "Expectans expectavi," in three sections, and here again we are introduced to the Sacrifice of the Cross. The Psalm is found in Matins for Good Friday. The explanatory heading in our Douay version is "Christ coming and redeeming mankind," and in some of our editions of the Vulgate, "Christus ut hostiam se offert; petit a malis liberationem et remissionem peccatorum." That David had Christ in view in this psalm is certain; it is St. Paul who opens out for us very clearly the prophetic force of the well-known passage, "Sacrifice and oblation thou didst not desire, etc." (verses 7, 8, 9). Turning to Hebrews x., 7, 8, 9, we find him insisting on the insufficiency of the sacrifices of the Law. "It is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats, sin should be taken away," and so Christ "taketh away the first, that He may establish that which followeth" (verse 9); "therefore coming into the world He saith: 'Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not: but a body thou hast fitted to Me: holocausts for sin did not please Thee. Then said I: Behold I come: in the head of the book it is written of Me: that I should do Thy will, O God.'"

And as Christ speaks in His own name in these verses, we may very reasonably imagine Him speaking also in the following; in which case we shall discover many strong passages bearing on His sacred Passion. "I have not hid Thy justice within My heart: I have declared Thy truth and Thy salvation" (verse 11). The words recall the scene and the answer, when the high priest asked Jesus of His disciples and of His doctrine, and Jesus answered him: "I have spoken openly to the world: I have always taught in the

synagogue and in the temple whither all the Jews resort: and in private I have spoken nothing. Why askest thou Me? Ask them who have heard Me what I have spoken to them: behold, they know what things I have said" (John xviii., 20). "I have declared Thy justice in a great church * * * I have not concealed Thy mercy and Thy truth from a great council" (verse 11). "Evils without number have surrounded Me; My iniquities have overtaken Me"—the sins of all mankind which I have taken upon Me—"and My heart hath forsaken Me." The mind travels fast in these psalms from one scene of the Passion to another; and so we find ourselves once more rehearsing in memory the soul-conflict in Gethsemane, where the Divine Protagonist in this struggle to the death would seem to have taken on Himself more than human nature could well endure.

The psalmist in consequence strikes the note so familiar to us; the agony does not stand alone; it can never be dissociated from the prayer; and so, immediately on the avowal that courage had almost failed Him—"My heart hath forsaken Me"—comes the appeal for help from on high: "Be pleased, O Lord, to deliver Me; look down, O Lord, to help Me: not My will, but Thine, be done," for "in the head of the book it is written of Me that I should do *Thy* will." After the prayer of holy resignation, three verses recall in rather a striking way the scene of the betrayal: "Let them be confounded * * * that seek after My soul to take it away. Let them be turned backward and be ashamed that desire evils unto Me. Let them immediately bear their confusion that say to Me, 'tis well, 'tis well.'" Here of a truth are the enemies of Christ, come "with lanterns and torches and weapons"; here is the false friend who had often greeted his Master with a "euge, euge," and now comes yet once again to hail Him with every appearance of affectionate regard; the truth being that they are come "to seek after His soul to take it away": for "Jesus knowing all things that should come upon Him, went forth and said to them: 'Whom seek ye?' * * * and when He had said to them, 'I am He,' they went backward and fell to the ground" (John xviii., 5). The passage is equally applicable from a devotional point of view to the closing scenes on Mount Calvary. The "*complacet tibi Domine, ut eruas me * * * ad adjuvandum Me respice*" will be Christ's earnest appeal to be delivered speedily from the pangs of death that the triumph of the Resurrection may soon be an accomplished fact: and the "*Ferant confestim confusionem suam * * **" is a prophecy cast in the form of a prayer, of the imminent confusion of those who but now are gloating over their victim with repeated "euges," to one another and insulting cries like the "*Vah! qui destruis templum * * **"

(cfr. Schouppe on this verse). The torrent of malice was brought to a sudden halt when Jesus, crying with a loud voice, gave up the ghost; "and behold the veil of the temple was rent * * * and the earth quaked * * * and graves were opened * * * and bodies arose * * * and the centurion with others watching Jesus were sore afraid, saying 'Indeed this was the Son of God,' " It was increasingly clear that things had taken the wrong turn; and confusion was twice confounded when the "guards came into the city and told the chief priests all things that had been done" on that first bright Easter morn. But because "they had regard to vanities and lying follies" (verse 5), they must needs bribe the soldiers as they had bribed Judas; so they took counsel and "gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: 'Say you, His disciples came by night and stole Him away when we were asleep.' " All their malicious schemes against the Anointed of God were doomed to failure. It was only a question of waiting. "With expectation I have waited for the Lord * * * He heard My prayers and brought Me out of the pit of misery and the mire of dregs"—a powerful figure surely of the ignominy to which Christ was subjected in the course of His Sacred Passion, for these "pits" referred to often in Holy Scripture were a species of prison to which there were no openings except a hole at the top, which served for both door and window; and generally they were in a filthy and revolting state and deep in mud. The "mire of dregs" suggests that the suffering was as one who cannot find a foothold, but slips and sinks. Positive misery was thus accentuated by the absence of solid comfort by which sorrow might have been rendered supportable. And so in great measure with the Divine Sufferer, who became as a "worm and no man," "mendicus et pauper," stripped of His very garments. But Jesus is the true Joseph taken from the pit to be Lord of all. "Quia Dominus sollicitus est mei * * * adjutor meus et protector meus." And so the psalm ends with the assurance that God is our "Helper" in present distress, our "Protector" from all ills of the future: "Deus meus, ne tardaveris"; "patiently have I waited"; all through those three and thirty years, through the three years of ingratitude and opposition, then all through the agony in the Garden, the long night, the mock trials, the painful Way of the Cross; delay no longer, O Lord, but deliver Me now at long last from all the evils that have compassed Me about, by a speedy and glorious Resurrection."

Sext follows on with the "Beatus qui intelligit" (xl.) and the "Quemadmodum desiderat" (xli), the latter being in two parts. There can be no doubt that the "Beatus qui intelligit" is one of the psalms of the Passion (Schouppe has "Sic enim eum patres accip-

iunt"), and that this must be so is clear from Christ's own quotation of verse 10 as a prophecy of the treason of Judas: "* * * that the Scripture may be fulfilled, 'He that eateth bread with Me shall lift up his heel against Me'" (John xiii., 18). The analogy between this verse and those both preceding and following it postulates reference to Christ throughout. In the second, third and fourth verses the prophet speaks of Christ; after that, Christ Himself is introduced as speaking in the first person. Bellarmine's exegesis of this psalm will be found very useful for our purpose; and we can hardly do better than confine ourselves to it.

"Blessed is the man that understandeth concerning the needy and the poor." Christ is the poor man, naked, hanging on His Cross; that is, blessed is he who deeply meditates on His Passion; for Jeremias had already said: "Attend and see if there be sorrow like unto My sorrow"; and the Apostle repeats the same (Heb. xii.): "For think diligently upon Him who endureth such opposition from sinners against Himself." For they who understand and seriously meditate on the Passion of Christ have an unspeakable treasure prepared for them. "The Lord will deliver him in the evil day." On that day the lovers of the Cross of Christ and who for His sake had been generous to the poor will be quite secure. "I said, O Lord, be Thou merciful to me," words that may be taken as though it were Christ Himself speaking to His Passion; thus, be Thou merciful to me in my trouble, and quickly raise me, and thus free me from my suffering; heal my soul, which is sorrowful unto death, and thus is sad, dejected, languishing, fearing, grieving; for "I have sinned against Thee," I have taken the sins of the whole world on Myself. And inasmuch as we have in verse 12, "Thou hast upheld me by reason of my innocence," it is clear that the person speaking here is not David nor any one else but He who alone was innocent, as far as his own acts were in question, while He bore the sins of others. "My enemies have spoken evils against Me * * *" apparently intended for the Pharisees and priests of the Jews, who thirsted intensely for the death of Christ, and had frequent conferences on the subject of it; "when shall he die and his name perish?" "And if he came in to see me, he spoke vain things: his heart gathereth together iniquity to itself * * *" From the Jews he passes to Judas, who came in to see if the time had come for betraying me; who invented falsehood for fear his purpose should be detected, and having played the part of a friend apparently, he went out to his enemies with his treacherous proposal, and the enemies began to "whisper" in conference with each other, they "devised evils," discussed the amount that should be given and took measures for my capture and subsequent death. "They determined against

me an unjust word," in their bitterness, prejudging my case, plotting a mock trial, and whether innocent or not, determining on my death. And now the reason for this sudden resolve: all their difficulties are unexpectedly solved by the arrival of a traitor in the very midst of their deliberations: "homo pacis meae." "Even the man of my peace, in whom I trusted, who ate my bread, hath greatly supplanted me." Observe here with St. Augustine that Judas is called the man of peace, because the prophet foresaw that Christ would be betrayed by a kiss, the sign of peace. It was Judas, then, not only not His enemy, but His friend, nay more than His friend, on most intimate terms with Him, loaded with favors by Him. For on the very night that he betrayed Christ, he not only partook of his ordinary meal with Him, but even received the Bread of Angels from Him; had his feet washed by Him, and thus had got most convincing proofs of His extreme humility and love for him. "But Thou, O Lord, have mercy on Me, and raise Me up again; and I will requite them": in the form of a prayer He prophesies what was to happen * * * He punished them as they deserved. They have been scattered all over the world, without a king, without a priest, without God, as Christ Himself predicted: "your house shall be left unto you desolate * * * they shall not leave in thee a stone upon a stone." In verse 11 He states that His prayer is heard: "In hoc cognovi quoniam voluisti Me; quoniam non gaudebit inimicus meus super Me": literally fulfilled in Judas, who hung himself before the death of Christ, and before he could make any use of his ill-got bribe. The words may also be applied to all His enemies, whose triumph was so short that it could hardly be called a triumph at all. The concluding verse, "Benedictus Dominus * * * usque in saeculum," may be the joyous exclamation either of the prophet or of Christ Himself, and signifies that God is blessed forever more by reason of the exaltation of His Son, "propter innocentiam," and the confusion of His enemies. *Fiat, fiat.*

The second part of *Sext*, "*Quemadmodum desiderat*," is in two sections, each ending with the same refrain, "*Spera in Deo quoniam adhuc confitebor illi; salutare vultus mei et Deus meus.*" From verse 6 it is clear that the sacred writer was in the land beyond the Jordan: "*Memor ero tui de terra Jordanis, et Hermoniim a monte modico*," near the mountain ridges of Hermon, in that land which was emphatically the land of exile—the refuge of exiles, and the whole tone of the psalm is that of one looking for a speedy restoration to his native land. This point is worthy of note in our devotional exegesis because at once it puts us *en rapport* with our meditations on the Passion. Man was in exile from his native land. The fullness of time had come: the day of redemption and restora-

tion was at hand. The Sacred Heart of the Redeemer can wait no longer. "I am come to do the will of My Father; I have a baptism wherewith I am to be baptized: and how I am straitened until it be accomplished." "*Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum; ita desiderat anima mea ad te Deus. Stivit anima mea * * **"; there is an element almost of impatience in this yearning: "*Quando veniam et apparebo ante faciem Dei,*" in the midst of the great sanctuary of heaven where I may begin my mediatorial functions, where I may continue "to make intercession" for the fallen exiled race: "with desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer." We are not surprised to find, therefore, that this psalm occurs in the Office of Corpus Christi. That Paschal festivity which gave us the "Memorial of the Passion" was not simply an occasion of joyous longing; heavy clouds had already begun to lower, the tempest was not far distant, the heart of our Saviour was heavy, and we shall easily recognize this mournful note even in this psalm, full though it is of hope and promise. "My tears have been My bread day and night, whilst it is said to Me daily: where is Thy God." Such was the bitter taunt that Christ Himself had to listen to. "He trusted in God; let Him now deliver Him. * * * If Thou be the Son of God, come down from the Cross."

NONE.

The "*Deus auribus nostris audivimus*" (three sections) might almost be termed an epitome of the thoughts suggested in the preceding Hours, and echoes faithfully the sentiments of the pious soul meditating in mingled grief and hope beneath the Cross, when the solemn echo of the "*Consummatum est*" died away in the darkness. Thoughts come crowding in, wave after wave, with bewildering rapidity: thoughts of the Redemption and the manifold blessings that were to come with it; thoughts of the Redeemer, His anguish, desolation, innocence; thoughts of the redeemed, their hopes, pleadings and ultimate restoration: all these considerations, like so many shafts of light, come flashing across the bitter waters of sorrow, illuminating the dark night of the soul.

(a) The blessings of Redemption, first of all, are clearly typified by the great deeds which God had wrought for His people in the days of old. The psalm calls to mind how gratuitously God had given the nation possession of the promised land, driving out their enemies before them. This assuredly is what Christ effected in the spiritual order by His redeeming power. "Thy right hand destroyed the Gentiles * * * and Thou plantedst *them*," *i. e.*, Thine own people, as is sung on Good Friday, "*Vinea mea electa, ego te plan-*

tavi," and similarly all through the "improperia." The divinity of the Redeemer is also well brought to the front in this part of the psalm, from the emphasis which is laid on the fact that God alone is the efficient cause of all past benefits, man himself being powerless: "for I will not trust in my bow; neither shall my sword save me * * * but Thou art Thyself my King and my God: who commandest the saving of Jacob * * * in God shall we glory all the day long, and in Thy name we will give praise forever" (verses 7, 5, 9).

(b) The second part of the psalm begins at verse 10, and the transition is very sudden. It is as though the soul, lost in ecstasy for the moment, and pursuing the thought of Redemption to its logical conclusion of glory and victory, suddenly remembers that the Cross is still there, and with the sight of the Divine Victim hanging lifeless on it, the whole tragedy is vividly reënacted: "Tota die verecundia mea contra me est * * * Now thou hast cast us off and put us to shame. * * * Thou hast made us a reproach to our neighbors, a scoff and derision to them that are round about us. Thou hast made us a bye-word among the Gentiles, a shaking of the head among the peoples. * * * Thou hast given us up like sheep to be eaten" (verses 16, 10, 14, 15, 12).

(c) And yet "Popule meus quid feci tibi": "If I have done evil give testimony of the evil"; the innocence of the Divine Victim is now recalled in verses 18, 19, 21: "Haec omnia venerunt super nos, nec oblitus sumus te * * * we have not done wickedly in Thy covenant, our heart hath not turned back * * * if we have forgotten the name of our God, and if we have stretched our hand to a strange God. * * * Arise, why sleepest Thou, O Lord? Why hast Thou forsaken Me? * * * Why turnest Thou Thy face away and forgettest our want and our trouble?"

(d) Deep though the gloom which hangs over Calvary at the Hour of *None*, the star of hope begins already to glimmer. Instinctively the soul descries on the not very distant horizon the harbinger of victory. It has not forgotten the promised "sign" of Jonas the prophet, nor yet the words of the Redeemer Himself, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will rebuild it," and so after the ebb and flow of deep emotions throughout the course of the "Hours" it now finds itself buoyant with hope on the crest of the wave: "The Lord will arise"; He will hear our prayer; He is faithful and true; "Exurge * * * adjuva nos et redime nos propter nomen tuum" (verse 26).

(To be continued)

G. E. PRICE.

BENJAMIN MAJOR, OR THE GRACE OF CON- TEMPLATION.

(By Richard of St. Victor.)

PREFACE.

BY THE Tabernacle of the Covenant is to be understood the state of perfection. Where there is perfection of the soul, there is the habitation of God. As much as the soul approaches to perfection, so much the closer is it united with God; but this same tabernacle ought to have a court lying round about it (as the Tabernacle of Moses had). By the court understand the discipline of the body, by the tabernacle the discipline of the mind. Where exterior discipline is wanting, interior discipline is certainly not to be found. True discipline of the body is useless, certainly, without the discipline of the mind. The court lies in the open air and the discipline of the body is manifest to all. Those inside the tabernacle were not seen by those outside. And no one knows what the interior of man is, except the spirit of man which is within him. The condition of the interior man is divided into reasonable and intellectual. The reasonable state is understood by the exterior tabernacle, but the intellectual state by the interior tabernacle. We call that sense reasonable by which we discern ourselves and our affairs, here we call that intellectual by which we are raised up to the speculation of divine things.

A man goes out from the tabernacle into the court by the exercise of works. He enters into the first tabernacle when he returns into himself. By transcending himself discreetly he is raised to God. The man dwells in the first by consideration of himself, but in the second by the contemplation of God. In the court of the tabernacle was the altar of holocaust. In the first tabernacle were the candelabra, the table and the altar of incense. In the interior tabernacle was the ark of the covenant. By the exterior altar is signified affliction of the body; by the interior altar, contrition of soul. By the candelabra is meant the grace of discretion; by the table, the doctrines of Holy Writ. By the ark of the covenant understand the grace of contemplation.

On the exterior altar the flesh of the animals was burnt, and by afflicting the body the carnal desires of the body are annulled. In the lower altar the aromatic smoke was burnt to the Lord, and by contrition of heart the fire of celestial desires is kindled. The candlestick carries the light and discretion is the lantern of the interior man. On the table the food is placed with which the hungry are refreshed. But sacred reading is certainly the food of

souls. The ark is the hiding-place for the gold and silver, and the grace of contemplation contains the treasure of celestial wisdom.

And so good works belong to the exterior altar, studious meditation to the candelabra, sacred reading to the table, devout prayer to the interior altar, to the ark the contemplation of divine works. These are the five exercises in which the work of our justification is complete. Verily, is the ark said to be of sanctification, in which the consummation of our justification is prefigured. The exercise of good works belongs to the discipline of the exterior man. It is agreed that the rest belongs to the discipline of the interior man. They are in the tabernacle and hide in secret. Through the ark of the covenant, the grace of contemplation is to be understood, through which a certain pledge of love is conferred by God upon His lovers. Contemplation is a free perspicacity of mind, in looking into the things of wisdom with attentive admiration.

There are six kinds of contemplation, each distinct from the other. Two are concerned with visible creatures, two with invisible creatures, and the two last turn upon divine things. To those to whom only two kinds are given, they are said to have wings like an eagle. To those to whom four kinds happen to be given, four wings are said to be given to one and four wings to the other. Those who arrive at all kinds of contemplation receive as it were six wings. Therefore you may say of these, six wings are given to one and six to the other. But the four first are concerned with either visible or invisible created things, the two last concerning divine things. The first four are figured by the ark, the two others by the form of an angel. It seems to belong to the first kind of contemplation, to bring visible things into consideration and admiration. To the second kind, to bring to light the hidden causes of things and to hold the mind in admiration of them. In that we admire with exultation the magnitude, the multitude and the utility of visible things, in this we examine with admiration the reason of visible things. We look upon the beauty of visible things by imagination, we examine the causes of visible things by reasoning. The first kind of contemplation is distinguished by three degrees: the first in things, the second in works, the third in manners. The consideration of things is signified by the length of the ark, the consideration of works by the width of it, and the consideration of manners is signified by the height of the ark. Three things are much to be admired in the rational creature: subtlety of being, discerning of good and evil and free will. The free will of man is very well known. Daily we read these things in our hearts, but who I ask is able to see the substance of his own soul,

and by what sense? I can neither see thine nor thou mine. Nor is any one able to see his own. On this point as long as we live our knowledge cannot extend to a full cubit.

Those things which concern our propitiation are signified by the length and width of the ark, those which pertain to our glorification to its height. But who can understand these things and by what sense: for it is said, "the eye does not see, nor the ear hear nor has it entered into the heart of man." The two last kinds of contemplation turn on divine things as we have said. They look to that which is above reason, but nevertheless not beyond reason. Those things are above reason which exceed the manner of a man's capacity: nevertheless they are consonant with reason, although they are not able to be comprehended by him. In those things on which the last kind of contemplation is concerned, things contrary to reason are seen, and such things as with which no reason could agree, unless faith should direct her to them. This last kind of contemplation is expressed by an angelical form. It certainly behooves us to put on an angelical form, if we wish to fly to the contemplation of eternal and divine things. But this angelical form was commanded to be made ductile, and of gold (in the ark), therefore that it may be of gold the mind of the contemplator must be cleansed from all phantasies. It is made ductile by drawing out, and our cherubim are commanded to be ductile. Hence therefore it is manifest that we must acquire that kind of grace which is better for compunction than for investigation. The excellence of these contemplations is praised in that which is named the cherubim. For in this double contemplation we are promoted to the fullness of knowledge. For there is nothing to seek or find for the increase of knowledge beyond these. It was said above that we ascend by visible things to the contemplation of invisible things. So verily we are raised up through the knowledge of the invisible creature, to the contemplation of the natural mother of things. This is why the cherubim are commanded to turn their faces to the mercy-seat: this is why one is commanded to stand on one side and the other on the other side. In this contemplation which is understood by the mercy-seat or the propitiary, much similitude of divine things, and much dissimilitude is found. For the spiritual creature is made to the image and likeness of God. One therefore of the cherubim before mentioned holds the side of likeness and the other of unlikeness. But the cherubim are commanded to spread their wings and cover the mercy-seat. What is an extension of wings unless a preparation for flying? This preparation of the mind is turned by flight into eternal things, and into

the shadow. Into the shadow, I say, from the heat of the day, and into a hiding place and a protection from the whirlwind and the rain. But the cherubim ought to turn their faces to the mercy-seat and from gazing upon the image of God, to be instructed more surely in the sublimer kinds of knowledge. The said cherubim ought to regard each other mutually, and to agree in all things asserted by each other. And both must beware that what one affirms the other does not contradict. Thus by one the assertion of the unity is made that the confession of the Trinity be not made void. And so in the other the confession of the Trinity is made that the assertion of the unity be not made void.

By the table of atonement we understand the doctrine of sacred learning. He who aspires to divine revelations let him listen to these comparisons. Rightly is the mercy-seat called an oracle, for thence divine answers are given. The Lord speaks above the mercy-seat or oracle, when He inspires the spirit with things above the measure of the man's knowledge. It is heard from the midst of the cherubim, because it is seen to agree in an equal manner with each. The covenant is placed in the ark near the Dominican precepts. For we are taught to do this in the highest things: firmly to retain in our innermost souls what we have learnt in prayer. The principal commandments of God are called the covenant or testimony, because they bear witness to the conscience of each. Secondly they give testimony to every one as to how much he loves His God. Concerning this highest grace of contemplation, I have spoken with brevity, for I shall discourse upon other things more widely.

By the table of proposition we understand the doctrine of sacred learning; on the table is placed the food that it may be consumed, for refreshment. There is bodily food and spiritual food. That is of the body, this of the spirit: worldly knowledge procures that, the Divine Scriptures this; rightly the divine food of souls is placed in Scripture, and thence it is deservedly called the table of proposition. But the state of human life was one thing under the hope of future redemption and it is right that it should be another (thing) under the faith of the redemption, now accomplished. The Old Testament deals with one, the New Testament with the other. The Holy Scriptures then deal sufficiently with both, hence it is said that the ark was two cubits long. Certainly both Testaments apply only to the care of souls. It is silent about the care of the body, and leaves worldly knowledge alone. It deals therefore with one and not with a double charge, thence it is said to be one cubit in width. But inasmuch as pertains to the manner of our reparation, it deals sufficiently with the state of this present life. It teaches

few things concerning the future: for its height is only a cubit and a half. The full cubit concerns the present state, the half-cubit pertains to the future.

The table of proposition is made of wood, it is overlaid with gold, it is surrounded with a ledge or lip, it is decorated with double crowns. Through the wooden-work we are to understand the historic sense, through the ledge is figured rhetoric, and through the double crown, allegory and mysticism. The table is made of setim wood, which is said to be exceedingly incorruptible. And so sacred history belongs to incorruptible wood, free as it is from all falsehood and foolishness. By the gilding of the table, understand the subtle and wise exposition of the same. It is to be noticed that the first work is gilded, but the other three are not gilded but golden. That which is between the wood and the gold is that which is between the historical and the mystical sense. In Holy Scripture history holds the first place. But the mystical intelligence is certainly divided into three parts. Rhetoric holds one place, allegory the middle, and mysticism the highest. Does not the heart hold highest that which concerns the highest and heavenly things? Allegory turns much upon the sacraments of our faith, and such are to be believed much more than they are to be understood. Rhetoric is concerned with those things which any one easily takes hold of, and understands and it raises them higher. Through the golden ledge or lip, then, I understand the mystical and moral intellect. Something great is signified by this figure of the lip. We know that all our words are formed by the lips. Therefore it is given to be understood that even our common speech ought to be formed by rhetoric. The crown was placed above a polished ledge, because allegory turns upon more subtle and sublimer things. Polished work is accustomed to have certain artificial and as it were hidden places, and who is surprised that allegory in a wonderful way is woven with history? For those things are inserted allegorically, which can scarcely be believed and are not able to be comprehended. The polished crown has its surface plain here, concave there, and perforated there. By the plain is meant those things which are according to reason: by the concave those which are above reason, and by the perforated those things which are contrary to reason. Rhetoric is one thing and far different is allegory. For what is rhetoric unless moral science, and what is allegory unless the mystical doctrines of mysteries? Virtuous customs are naturally written in the human heart. But no one presumes unless rashly to sound from his own sense the depths of mysteries. Hence the height of the crown is said to be only four finger lengths. What I ask are the Holy Gospels but the fingers of the right hand of the Most

High? Allegorical doctrine is formed to their measure, when it agrees with their sayings in all things.

Notice that the crown is ordered to be made with a ledge, because by the virtue of the sacraments the discipline of manners is made useful and capable of being observed. Through the crown, as was said, we understand the golden mystical doctrine. This doctrine concerns the highest things, hence its immense figure obtains the highest place. For what shall we say of mysticism, except that it is the mystical knowledge leading upwards to the highest heavenly things. The foreseeing of rewards hoped for looks by mysticism. The double eminence alone among all is crowned with gold, because Holy Scripture alone is used allegorically and mystically in a mystical sense. It is very much to be noticed that the holy doctors are always ready to give a reason to those asking, for the faith and hope that is in them.

ON THE GRACE OF CONTEMPLATION AS PREFIGURED IN THE ARK
OF MOSES.

CHAPTER I.—A COMMENDATION OF CONTEMPLATION.

Many things have already been said concerning this grace, but many still remain which may with advantage be said. What the ark of Moses signified mystically in an allegorical sense, and in what way it pointed to Christ, was said by the doctors of the Church before us, and drawn out in the clearest way. Nor do we suspect ourselves of the temerity of incurring carelessness concerning the same, if we say something about this subject from a moral point of view. But that the studious drawing-out of this matter more fully may be sweetened to us, let us consider what that most excellent of the prophets felt concerning it, who calls it the ark of sanctification: "Rise up," he says, "O Lord, in Thy rest, Thou and the ark of Thy strength." (Ps. cxxxi.) Let us consider first why it is called the ark of sanctification. Moses teaches us that we are diligently to consider and to retain what this thing, which is called the ark of sanctification, may be, saying: "Be ye holy as I am holy." (Lev. xi.) If Moses is to be believed, we know that whosoever touched this ark should be sanctified. If it is thus everywhere, all people would seek to touch it, for the reward, if the virtue of sanctification went out from it. I think something precious is placed in this ark. I should like much to know what this ark may be, which is able to sanctify those coming to it, so that it can be called the ark of sanctification. But I do not doubt that it is wisdom which conquers malice. For I know that those who are healed from the beginning are healed through wisdom. And it is agreed that no

one is able to please God unless wisdom has been with him. But who doubts that it pertains to the sanctification of man, to be purged from all his impurity, and his mind cleansed from all malice and wickedness. It is purged through wisdom supervening strongly and conquering malice, and to be thus purged is as I judge to be sanctified.

No one will I think doubt that the ark was the chief and principal sanctuary, which the tabernacle of the covenant contained. Therefore in seeking what grace this sanctuary signifies, which is higher than all others, he easily discovers unless he doubts what was the better part which Mary (Magdalene) chose. And what was that better part unless to sit and see how sweet the Lord is? For Martha, as Scripture says, was troubled in serving, while Mary sat at His feet and listened to His words. And so she understood by hearing the highest wisdom of God hidden in the flesh, which she was not able to see with the eyes of the flesh, and in understanding she saw, and sitting in this way, and listening, she arrived at the contemplation of the highest truth. This is the chosen and perfect part which shall never be taken away: for the contemplation of truth is begun in this world, but in the future it is exercised continually for ever. O what a singular grace! O what a singular preference through which we are sanctified in the present and beatified in the future!

CHAPTER II.—WHICH MAY BE USEFUL TO THOSE ADVANCING IN THIS
GRACE.

That ark which by David is called the ark of sanctification, by Moses is called the ark of the covenant. We know that precious things, such as gold and silver and precious stones, were accustomed to be placed in the ark. If we think of the treasures of wisdom and knowledge we shall find more quickly what may be the hidden-place of these treasures. For what does the ark signify in this case but the human intelligence? But the ark was made and decorated with gold by the divine command, that is when the human intelligence is moved by divine inspiration, and revelation to the grace of contemplation. But when in this life we arrive at this grace, what else do we receive than certain pledges of its future fullness, when we shall inherit perpetually eternal contemplation? And so we receive this grace as a pledge of the divine promise, as it were a token of divine love, like the bond of the covenant, and a sign of mutual love. Dost thou now not see how rightly this is called the ark of the covenant of the Lord, in which and through which such a grace is typified? But he who like Jacob would arrive at the

embrace of the Lord, must like him serve seven years, that he may learn to desist not only from evil works, but also from vain and wandering thoughts. There are many who know how to be idle in body, but do not in the least know how to be free in heart, and those who being at rest in the body are wandering about everywhere in heart, never deserve to see how sweet the Lord is, how good is the God of Israel to those who are of a right heart. Moses, in many places of his Scriptures, deals with this grace in figurative language, but here it is distinguished more fully, in a mystical description, where it is divided into different kinds.

CHAPTER III.—IN WHAT WAY CONTEMPLATION DIFFERS FROM MEDITATION AND THOUGHT.

(Know then that we look upon the same matter in one way by thought; we examine it in another way by meditation, and we wonder at it in another way by contemplation. These three things differ from each other in manner, although they agree in matter. Inasmuch as thought deals with the same subject in one way, meditation in another and contemplation far otherwise. Thought wanders hither and thither in devious ways, with a slow foot, without regard to arriving. Meditation struggles through rough and hard ways, often with great labor and industry of mind to its appointed goal. Contemplation carries away the soul with wonderful agility, wherever the force bears her in a free flight. Thought creeps, meditation walks, and at most runs. But contemplation flies round all things and when it wishes flings itself into the highest. Thought is without labor and fruit; meditation is labor with fruit. Contemplation remains with fruit without labor. In thought there is wandering, in meditation investigation, in contemplation admiration. Thought is from the imagination meditation from the reason, and contemplation from the intelligence. Behold these three things—imagination, reason, intelligence. Intelligence obtains the highest place, imagination the lowest, reason the middle place. All things which the reason and the imagination do (and many other things which they do not) understand, are comprehended by the intelligence. See then how wide is the radius of contemplation, how far she extends who illuminates everything. Thought always passes from one thing to another by a wandering movement, meditation applies itself to one thing perseveringly, but contemplation spreads itself to innumerable things, under one radius of vision. And so through the intelligence, the path of the mind is extended into immensity, and the apprehension of the contemplating mind is shaped, that it may be capable of under-

standing many things and clear to penetrate subtle things. For contemplation is never able to exist without a certain vivacity of intelligence.

Often the mind of one contemplating is enlarged to the deepest things, often it is raised to the highest, often it is sharpened to inscrutable things, often it is snatched with a wonderful agility almost without delay, through innumerable things; all this it cannot be doubted is done by a certain power of the intelligence. Contemplation is always in things, either manifest through their own nature, or known familiarly through study, or made clear by divine revelation.

CHAPTER IV.—DEFINITION OF CONTEMPLATION, MEDITATION AND THOUGHT.

The chief theologian of our time has defined contemplation in these words: Contemplation is a free or uncontrolled quickness of mind in looking at the things of wisdom with suspended admiration. Meditation is the studious effort of the mind fixed upon something to be diligently investigated: or thus, meditation is a careful searching of the mind diligently occupied in inquiring for the truth, but thought is a careless consideration of the mind prone to wandering. So these three have a common, and as it were substantial aspect. For it is as common to contemplation as to meditation to be occupied about useful things, and to be employed assiduously in very deep studies of wisdom and knowledge. But in this they differ exceedingly from thought, which is accustomed to relax almost every moment on frivolous and silly things, and to pour itself without discretion on all things or to fall down headlong. But it is common to contemplation and to thought by a certain uncontrolled movement, and according to a spontaneous will to be carried hither and thither, and by no obstacle of difficulty to be hindered from the force of its discursion. But they differ exceedingly in this way from meditation, whose work is always a labor of industry, whether it be to understand some arduous difficulty of the mind, or to break into abstruse matters or to penetrate hidden things. Nevertheless, in such a wandering of our thoughts, it often happens that the mind meets something which it earnestly sought after and insisted upon.

But when the mind struggles to satisfy its desire in this kind of inquiry, the manner of thought goes beyond thinking, and thought passes into meditation. Something of the same kind sometimes happens to meditation. For the mind is accustomed to receive with avidity any truth long sought after and at length

found, to admire it with exultation and to remain a long time in admiration of it. And this is when meditation exceeds meditation and passes into contemplation. But it is peculiar to contemplation to abide with admiration in the earnest beholding of that which causes this exultation. And in this it differs as much from meditation as from thought. For thought, as we have just said, is always diverted hither and thither by an incessant wandering, but meditation always advances to higher things with a set purpose.

CHAPTER V.—CONCERNING THE MANIFOLD MODES OF CONTEMPLATION.

But when that clear ray of contemplation always remains, from the greatness of its admiration, suspended over something, it does not always act uniformly in one manner. For that vivacity of the intelligence of the soul of the contemplative sometimes goes and returns with wonderful agility, sometimes bends itself as it were in a circle, sometimes collects itself together as it were in one and fixes itself immovably. If we desire to understand this clearly we see something like it daily in the flight of birds. For we see some now lift themselves higher, now plunge lower, and often repeat the mode of these ascents and descents. Now we see some diverted to the right hand, now to the left, now passing a little in front on this side or that side, or scarcely moving at all in advance, and in many instances repeating these changes of their movements. Then with great velocity some will extend themselves in front. Presently with the same speed they will retire behind and repeat these movements, often and with frequency continue and protract these excursions and returnings for a long time.

You may if you will see some bend themselves as it were in a circle, or as suddenly or as often repeat these same or similar movements, now in a wider, now in a little narrower circle, and always return into the same. Or you may see some with tremulous and often reverberating wings suspend themselves for a long time in one and the same place and fix themselves as it were immovably in a movable agitation, and with much and long lingering in the place of their suspension, do not recede at all, and in the execution of the work and its earnestness they seem altogether to exclaim and say: "It is good for us to be here." (Luc. iv.) Truly, the flight of our contemplation is varied in many ways like this example, of a similar kind just set before us, and it is composed in a different way for a variety of persons and of subjects. Now from the lower to the higher, now from the higher to the lower,

it ascends and descends, and now from part to the whole, now from the whole to part of its consideration, it flies with its agility, and it draws its argument to that which it behooves to be known, now from the greater, now from the lesser. But it is diverted sometimes to this, sometimes to the opposite side, and elicits the knowledge of contraries from the knowing of contraries, and is accustomed to vary the execution of its reasoning, in a different way from that of its opposers. Sometimes it runs in front, and sometimes it goes back suddenly; it discovers the mode or quality of a thing sometimes from its effects, sometimes from its causes and sometimes from its antecedents or its consequences.

But when our steadfast gazing is led as it were into a circle, while the universals of everything that may be are considered with many, until to the one thing to be determined, now by similar things, now by things they possess or which happen to them in common, the reason is drawn and assigned. But then the fixing of our consideration on one and the same place remains as it were immovable, when in whatever the thing may be, either in looking into or admiring, the intention of the contemplator dwells uncontrolled. But lest our words should seem redolent of human philosophy, or to depart from the plain tenor of the simplicity of Catholic doctrine, let us say perhaps more conveniently, that to ascend and descend, to go and return, to turn now hither, now thither, sometimes to go round in a circle, or at length it may be nothing else than to remain in one, with the greatest agility, sometimes to pass in mind from things that are unlike to the different kinds of merits and rewards, sometimes to look into the circumstances or the subsistence of anything, with curious consideration, or sometimes in the novelty of any thing contemplated, to satiate the admiration of the soul with the novelty.

Now you see, as we said above, in what manner the time of our contemplation is always suspended or protracted round something, while the mind of the contemplative dwells uncontrolled upon the subject of its delight, while it studies always to go back into itself or to remain immovable longer in the same. Listen to what is said of this kind of contemplation by the prophet Ezekiel: "And the living creature ran and returned like flashes of lightning." (Ezech. i., 14.) He whose mind is rapt in diverse ways, and as it were running about now on this side, now on that with a wonderful agility, is moved in contrary directions, is described in the Book of Wisdom: "The just shall shine, and like sparks shall run about the reeds." He who goes as it were up and down, the psalmist expresses in a few words: "They go up to heaven and go down

into the abyss." (Ps. cvi.) To the kind of contemplation which is led as it were in a circle, thou art admonished by that prophetic voice which says: "Lift up thine eyes round about and look." (Isai. lxi.) But the ray of contemplation is fixed in one place as it were immovably when, as Habacuc experienced in himself (Habac. iii.), "The sun and the moon stood in their habitation." Behold now we have taught by determining and defining what contemplation is. It remains that we should divide it into species, and we shall see in the following pages what the kinds of contemplation are.

CHAPTER VI.—THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF CONTEMPLATION.

There are six kinds of contemplation divided entirely from each other and within themselves. The first is in the imagination and according to the imagination only. The second is in the imagination according to reason. The third is in the reason according to the imagination. The fourth is in the reason and according to reason. The fifth is above, but not beyond reason. The sixth is above reason and seems to be beyond reason. And so two are in the imagination, two in the reason and two in the intelligence.

Our contemplation without doubt is exercised in the imagination when it is led into consideration by the form of these visible things and by an image, when motionless we give our attention, and attending admire those bodily things which we take in by a corporeal sense, noting how great, how numerous, how different, how beautiful or how joyful they may be, and in all these created things we venerate in admiring, and admire in venerating, the power, the wisdom and the munificence of their Creator. But then our contemplation is exercised in the imagination, and is formed according to the imagination alone, when we seek nothing by argument nor investigate anything by reasoning, but our uncontrolled mind runs hither and thither, whither the admiration snatches it, in this kind of steadfast beholding.

The second kind of contemplation remains indeed in the imagination; nevertheless, it is formed and proceeds according to reason, which is done when we turn to those things which are in the imagination, and which we just said belong to the first kind of contemplation, we seek and find the reason and are led with admiration in their consideration to finding and knowing. And so in the first we examine diligently these things, in this we examine, we behold steadfastly, we admire the reason of them, the order, disposition and cause of each, its mode and utility.

We said that the third kind of contemplation was formed in the

reason according to the imagination. But truly we use this kind of contemplation when through the similitude of visible things we are raised up to gazing upon invisible things. But this beholding remains in the reason, because it stops by intention and investigation in those things only which go forth from the imagination, it applies itself to invisible things only, and especially it understands these only by the reason. But it is said to be formed according to the imagination, because in this contemplation a likeness is drawn from the image of visible things whereby the mind is helped in the investigation of invisible things. The fourth kind of contemplation is what is formed in the reason according to the reason: and this is made thus, the matter of it being removed from the imagination, the mind tends to those things only which the imagination does not know, and which it gathers together from the reason or comprehends through the reason. We rest in this kind of contemplation when we know our invisible things by experience, and are led to the consideration of them and take them in through the intelligence: and from their contemplation we ascend to celestial thoughts and to the supreme contemplation of intellectual good things. But this kind of contemplation is rightly said to remain in the reason, because these same invisible things are comprehended by our reason, and do not in the least go above reason.

The fifth kind of contemplation we said was above reason, but nevertheless not beyond reason. In this kind of contemplation we ascend by an elevation of the mind when we know these things by divine revelation, which no human reason can fully comprehend, and which none of our reasoning is sufficient to investigate fully. Such are those things which we believe concerning the nature of the Divinity, and its simple Essence and which we prove by the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Therefore our contemplation now truly ascends above reason, when the soul discovers through the elevation of the mind what the measure of human capacity transcends.

The sixth kind of contemplation is said to be exercised in those things which are above reason, but seem to be beyond or even contrary to reason. In this highest and most worthy kind of contemplation the soul now truly exults and revels, when by a ray of divine light she knows and considers those things which human reason gainsays. Such are almost all those things which we are commanded to believe concerning the Persons of the Holy Trinity. Concerning which when the human reason is consulted it seems to do nothing else but disagree.

CHAPTER VII.—THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE COMMON TO ALL.

And so two of these kinds of contemplation remain in the imagination, because they reach only to sensible things. Two remain in the reason because they rest only in intelligible things. And two remain in the intellect because they concern only intellectual things. I call those sensible things which are as it were visible and perceptible by the bodily senses. I call those things intelligible which are invisible but comprehensible by the reason. In this place I call those things capable of being understood by the intellect invisible which are incomprehensible by the human reason. Therefore from these six kinds of contemplation, the four lower are exercised mostly upon created things, but the two highest in uncreated and divine things.

Again, of these four, the two higher are exercised upon invisible things. But the two lower concern visible and corporeal things. For the two lower undoubtedly are concerned with visible and created things. But the two highest are exercised greatly on invisible and uncreated things. The two middle kinds are concerned mostly with invisible and created things. Especially I would say therefore, that among invisible, created things, there are certain things which are in no wise able to be comprehended by the human reason, and among these are a number of things able to be understood by the intellect, which show themselves to belong rather to the two highest kinds of contemplation.

CHAPTER VIII.—OF THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE PROPER TO EACH.

It is proper to the first kind of contemplation to stay simply and without any reasoning in the admiration of visible things. It is proper to the second to fix upon the reason of visible things by reasoning. It is proper to the third to ascend from visible to invisible things by reasoning. It is proper to the fourth to infer invisible things from invisible by reasoning, and through the understanding of proved things to proceed to the knowledge of unknown things. It is proper to the fifth to admit reason in the understanding of intellectual things. It is proper to the sixth in the understanding of intellectual things, to transcend all human reasoning, and as it were to tread upon it. In the first kind the imagination holds the lowest and a solitary place. In the second kind the reason descends to the lowest. In the third the imagination ascends to the highest. In the fourth the intellect descends to the lowest. In the fifth the reason ascends to the highest. In the sixth the intellect holds a solitary and the highest place.

CHAPTER IX.—IN WHAT WAY THESE KINDS ARE ACCUSTOMED TO MIX
WITH EACH OTHER.

It is to be noted that as the last two kinds of contemplation ascend above reason, so the two middle ones ascend above the imagination. And as the sublimer of the two last is accustomed to admit almost no human reason, so the sublimer of the middle kinds ought to exclude from itself all imagination. And as that lower of the two last and highest is exercised above reason, but not beyond reason, so that lower of the two middle kinds ascends above the imagination, but nevertheless does not go beyond the imagination. Again as the two middle kinds descend below the pure and simple intelligence, so the two first and lowest kinds descend below reasoning. By the simple intelligence I mean that which is without any influence of the imagination. But as that sublimer of the two middle kinds descends below the simple intelligence, nevertheless it does not remain below it, because it comprehends some things of those in which it is exercised with the simple intelligence, and some it infers by reasoning; so that sublimer of the two lower seems to descend below reasoning, but not to remain below it, because it is accustomed to represent some things by the imagination, and to infer some things by reasoning. Some are accustomed to mix up these kinds of contemplation, which we have distinguished, with each other, and by mixing to confuse that special mode which we have assigned to them. But it was our part in this place to teach the doctrine of what is special to each kind, and to show what they have in common or what is similar in each.

CHAPTER X.—THAT THE PERFECT ONLY SCARCELY ARRIVE AT THE SIX
KINDS OF CONTEMPLATION.

It is important that he who would reach the highest point of this science should know the six kinds of contemplation familiarly. By these six wings of contemplation we are suspended from earthly things and raised up to heavenly. Thou mayst not doubt thyself to be near perfect, if up to the present thou art not worthy of some of them. It certainly goes well with me and with those like me, if only one or if one out of three pairs of wings is given. "Who will give me wings like a dove that I may flee away and be at rest?" (Ps. xlv.) Nevertheless I know that in two of these first sort of wings it is not given to fly away from earthly to heavenly things and to seek or to penetrate into those inaccessible things of heaven. For as it was just said above, in those six kinds of contemplation,

all consideration of the first two is occupied with earthly and corporeal things and not at all with invisible things.

Although therefore with these two first wings of contemplation we sometimes have sublime and subtle flights above these earthly things, we ought not to be content if we reach to those things only in which we see earthly philosophers to excel. Thou art proved to be a terrestrial and not a heavenly being as long as thou art content to fly with only two wings. Thou hast these wherewith to veil thy body, thou art able to fly with them. Certainly if thou art still an earthly being, if still thy body is concerned with daily earthly things, and in such as the Apostle describes and commands to mortify, it will certainly be good, to have ready that wherewith when thou wishest, thou art able to veil thy body and to hide it from the eyes of thy memory: "mortify," he says, "thy members, which are upon the earth, fornication, impurity, etc." (Closs. iii.)

But what does this veiling of the body under those wings called contemplation mean except to govern the desire of worldly things by the consideration of their changeableness, nay rather to forget them? You are pondering, as I judge, how much this covering and shadowing of the wings avails. When you wish to do so, you are able to fly with them. Verily it is good to fly well and get as far away from this world as you can. Well do they fly with these wings who consider daily the inconstancy of worldly changes and by diligent withdrawal alienate themselves from the ambition of them. Therefore although you may not be able with these double wings to fly to celestial things, nevertheless perchance you will be able to find a safe and quiet haven of rest in their flight. Labor with them as much as you are able, strive after the furthest parts of the sea: "If I should take my wings early in the morning and dwell in the furthest parts of the sea." (Ps. cxxxviii.) The uttermost parts of the sea, that is the end of the world and to every one the end of his own life. And so to arrive at the uttermost parts of the sea is to wait with desire for the end of the world, and to long to depart from this life. He has now reached the uttermost parts of the sea, as I judge, who has been able to say truly, "I desire to be dissolved and be with Christ." (Phill. i.)

I think you will not have received these two wings of contemplation in vain if you have been able to fly to here. Nevertheless it ought not to be sufficient to you to have received these two wings, but that you may prove yourself to be a celestial being study and take great care to have two pairs, and then you will have effectually wherewith you are able to fly to celestial things. Those four animals had truly four wings, and showed themselves

to be celestial and not terrestrial beings whom the prophet Eze^{kiel} saw and described in his vision, saying: "Every one had four faces and every one had four wings." (Ezek. i.) But with two as you read there, they veiled their bodies and with the two other doubtless they flew. And thus when you now begin to fly with four wings you may have considered yourself to be a celestial being, and now to wear a celestial body, nevertheless study to veil it under these said wings. For there are celestial bodies and terrestrial bodies, and some have the glory of the celestials and some have the glory of the terrestrial. "Some have the brightness of the sun and some have the brightness of the moon, and one star differs from another star in glory." (Cor. I., xv.)

If therefore thy whole body should be light, having no part of it in darkness, it would nevertheless be well for you to hide it from the eyes of human arrogance, and in the uncertainty of human changeableness to moderate the light of self-estimation, for "Man knoweth not his own end, but as fishes are taken with the hook, and as birds are caught with the snare, so men are taken in the evil time, when it shall suddenly come upon them." And so it is good for man to hide his own goodness and not to presume at all upon his merits, and to keep himself always in humility. With the first pair of wings, therefore, a man veils his body; with the second pair he flies to heaven. For why do not those two middle kinds of contemplation raise a man to celestial and invisible things, which, as was said, have to do with invisible things only? "For our conversation is in heaven" (Phil. iii.) Nevertheless if thou preparest continually to penetrate to the third heaven with the Apostle (II. Cor. xii) never mayest thou presume to do that with two pairs of wings. For it behooves him without doubt to have all these six wings named higher of contemplation, who desires and seeks to fly to the secret and hidden things of the Divinity in the third heaven. So the perfect only are scarcely able to have these six wings of contemplation in this life. In the future life all the elect among men as much as the angels will have these six wings; so that of both natures it is able truly to be said that one had six wings and the other had six wings.

CHAPTER XI.—IN WHAT WAY THE FOUR FIRST KINDS OF CONTEMPLATION ARE DESCRIBED MYSTICALLY.

And so these six kinds of contemplation, as it seems to me, Moses treats under a mystical description when he instituted that material but truly mystical ark, to be made according to the Divine command. And so the first kind is pointed out in the fab-

rication of the ark, the second in its decoration, the third in the crown of the ark and the fourth we understand through the propitiatory. Through the two Cherubim, the fifth and the sixth. But if we look at the figure about to be made and the material in those six works of the hands, we see only the first is made of wood; all the others consist of gold. Thus truly we take in through the bodily senses all those things in which the first kind of contemplation consists, and when we wish we represent them through the imagination. But all the other things from which the other kinds of contemplation are woven we collect by reasoning or we understand them through the simple intelligence. Think, therefore, what may be signified in comparison of the wood with the gold, and perchance you will find how conveniently this kind is represented by the wood and that kind is figured by the gold. In the wood indeed are those things which are subject to the imagination, by the gold are represented those things which belong to the intellect. Gold shines by itself with a great brightness; wood has in itself no brightness except what kindles fire and nourishes the ministering flame of the light. Thus truly the imagination has no light of prudence in itself nor anything excellent, except that which excites the reason in discretion and is accustomed to direct to the investigation of knowledge. But rightly that second kind of contemplation, in which the reason of visible things is sought, is figured by the gilding of the wood. For what else is the reason assigned to visible and imaginable things than, as I say, the gilding of the wood? Rightly, nevertheless, the crown of the ark is able to represent by a mystical interpretation the third kind of contemplation, in which we are accustomed to ascend through visible to invisible things and to rise up to the knowledge of them by the guidance of the imagination. For the crown is fixed at the top of the ark to the wood, but it oversteps the wood by stretching out. Thus that kind of contemplation which is exercised in the reason according to the imagination depends upon the imagination, while it draws the reason out of the likeness of imaginable things and erects as it were a ladder by which it is possible to ascend to the beholding of invisible things.

But the propitiatorium on every side and in all respects is placed above the wood, and therefore that kind of contemplation is very conveniently figured by it, which exceeding all imagination is exercised in the reason according to the reason. And as the propitiatory (inasmuch as it is a cover of the ark) never comes down below the wood nor permits itself to be fixed to the wood, so this contemplation overstepping all imagination, and not consenting to have

anything to do with it, looks at invisible things only and strains after invisible things only.

CHAPTER XII.—IN WHAT WAY THE TWO LAST KINDS OF CONTEMPLATION ARE DESCRIBED MYSTICALLY.

But the two last kinds of contemplation are expressed by an angelical figure. And rightly indeed that feature of the work had not a human but an angelical form, which it behooved to represent those kinds of contemplation through a similitude, the matter of which exceeds all human reason. It is discreetly to be noticed that those aforesaid four kinds are in a certain way joined in one. But these two last kinds are separate and placed by themselves. But in those first four kinds of contemplation we grow daily by our own industry, yet with the Divine help, and we proceed from one into the other. But in these two last kinds all depends upon grace, and they are altogether far off and exceedingly remote from all human industry, except the manner of the angelical likeness to himself. And perhaps not without cause this last feature of the work and angelical figure receives the name of the cherubim, perchance from him who without an increase of this supreme grace is not able to reach to the fullness of knowledge. But because of the two cherubim, one is said to stand on one side and the other on the other side, so one is understood to stand on the right hand and the other on the left. Observe, I beseech you, how aptly these are placed opposite to each other, and they are appointed to be opposite each other as it were in a figure of those things which consent to reason and of those things which are seen to be opposed to reason.

But perhaps some one will inquire what it behooves us to understand in each specially. See, therefore, whether in that cherubim who stands on the right hand, that kind of contemplation ought not to be understood which is above reason yet not beyond reason. But in that which is on the left hand, that kind which is above reason and is seen to be beyond reason. For we know that the left hand is often kept under the clothing and the right hand more frequently brought forth into the open. Thence and rightly hidden things are signified by the left and more manifest things are understood by the right hand. But the manifest things are agreeable to reason and the more hidden are contrary to reason. Therefore the fifth kind of contemplation is rightly understood by the cherubim on the right hand; and none the less the sixth is to be understood by the one on the left hand. And perhaps these things which have now been said concerning the ark of Moses and the grace of contemplation will suffice to the more learned souls. But

because we are careless and speak to the careless we ought not to be lazy ourselves, on account of the more lazy it may be useful and perhaps for some necessary to repeat in a supplement some of these things, and in working in the same material to add something still to it. And so let us deal with the manner of the contemplating and the order of the contemplations, for we cannot see in passing a work of such great delight nor the spectacle of such great admiration. We have added these things that we have now said in a compendium for the busy, but we explain further in repeating the same for the benefit of the leisurely, at the same time warning both beforehand, we shall detain those who would go too quickly and urge the curious explorers of novelties against this prayer.

Translated from the Latin by DARLEY DALE.

Stroud, England.



BROWNING'S BOTANY AND FLORAL MONUMENTS.

ALTHOUGH Robert Browning was first of all a dramatic poet, with humanity always the current, if not the whole stream of his thought, and although he wrote not a single flower poem, nevertheless one finds scattered all through his works lines which show him to be a devoted and discriminating botanist. He mentions by name nearly two hundred different specimens, incidentally or with a particular purpose, and this list contains some few plants almost wholly neglected by other poets. The "martagon," or Turk's-cap lily, so lovingly welcomed by Pippa, is the only poetical reference to this particular species which I have ever found:

"Oh, is it surely blown, my martagon?
New-blown and ruddy as St. Agnes' nipple!
Plump as the flesh-bunch on some Turkbird's poll!
Be sure if corals, branching 'neath the ripple
Of ocean, bud there—fairies watch unroll
Such turban-flowers! I say, such lamps disperse
Thick red flame through that dusk-green universe."

And in "May and Death" he devotes one stanza to the persicary, which no other poet has ever mentioned, to my knowledge:

"Only one little sight, one plant,
Woods have in May, that starts up green
Save a sole streak, which, so to speak,
Is spring's blood spilt its leaves between."

He excels in touches of intimate description which reveal a keen and discriminating observation. He tells us of "the *swinging* campanula bell which betrays the toiling bee within"; "galingale and watermint *out-smoothed* by the rippling streamlet"; "the *labyrinthine* bud of the rose"; "a peach curved *beewise* o'er its bough"; "*woolly* leaf-buds on the vine"; "the grape-bunch with the rain-water *slipping* o'er the *heavy* blue bloom on each globe"; "the white skin of each grape on the bunches *net-worked* with brown by the long, hot, dry autumn and marked *like a quail's crown*"; "the pom-pion-vine coating the cave-top *as a brow its eye*"; "*silken* barley-stalks sullied and bore earthwards by the rain"; "figs, rathe-ripe, rotten-rich, sweet-sour, *all tastes to take*"; "dark rosemary *ever a-dying*"; "the fig-leaf *like a hand* with five fingers"; and

"Cowslips, abundant birth,
O'er meadow and hillside, vineyard, too,
Like a schoolboy's scrawlings in and out
Distasteful lesson-book."

Often, too, he uses personification to strengthen the picture. There are "pine trees that *go up* the mountainside, row after row, like black priests, and *down* the other side again"; "withered wall-flowers *waving from the tower-top* like an elvish group with thin bleached hair that *lean out* of their topmost fortresses"; "the patching houseleek's head of blossoms that *winks* through the chinks of the dilapidated roof"; "small ferns that *fit their teeth* to the polished rocks"; "a *palsied* oak with a cleft like a *distorted mouth*"; "*frolic* myrtle trees and *grave* maple stocks"; "pansies, eyes that laugh, and violets, eyes that dream"; "a cypress that *points* like death's lean, uplifted finger"; and "a little river

"So petty yet so spiteful! All along,
 Low scrubby alders kneeled down over it;
 Drenched willows flung them headlong in a fit
 Of mute despair, a suicidal throng:
 The river, which had done them all the wrong,
 Whate'er that was, rolled by, deterred no whit."

His descriptions are impressionistic rather than detailed, and yet they always seem complete. They are boldly sketched in with a few all-sufficient words, and they contain the sudden glow, splash or flicker of color a painter would dash into his work. Indeed, Browning's love of color cannot be overlooked. "Sometimes," says Ruskin, "it is not color, it is conflagration." He has painted for us "the poppy's red effrontery"; "poppies red to blackness"; "rich dates yellowed o'er with gold dust"; "the centre spike of gold burning deep in the bluebell"; "pines begirt with ropes of snow"; "sanguine-hearted pomegranate blooms"; "green-fleshed melons"; "a weed whose one small orange cup amasses five green beetles"; "a mossy pillow blue with violets"; a "bruised black-blooded mulberry"; the "hyacinth's staff of honey-colored buds"; "pink leaflets budding on the beech"; "larches, scattered through the pine-tree solitudes, brightening"; the "first-larch bloom crisp and pink"; a "cornfield side a-flutter with poppies"; "a field, scalloped-striped with bands of beet and turnip and luzern, limited only by each color's end"; "the ash so proud to wear its berries"; and

"Mid the sharp short emerald wheat, scarce risen three fingers well,
 The wild tulip, at end of its tube, blows out its great red bell
 Like a thin clear bubble of blood, for the children to pick and sell."

A striking example of his love of color is found in this stanza, where rich black is added to dazzling gold and green:

"Fancy the Pampas' sheen!
 Miles and miles of gold and green

Where the sunflowers blow
 In a solid glow.
 And, to break now and then the screen,
 Black neck and eyeballs keen,
 Up a wild horse leaps between!"

Then, too, there is that prefatory lyric to "The Two Poets of Croisic," beginning:

"Such a starved bank of moss
 Till, that May-morn,
 Blue ran the flash across:
 Violets were born."

"By the Fireside" is a revel of autumnal glow and sparkle: the eye leaping from one object to another in pell-mell haste:

"Oh, the sense of the yellow mountain-flowers,
 And the thorny balls, each three in one,
 The chestnuts throw on our path in showers!
 For the drop of the woodland fruit's begun
 These early November hours,

"That crimson the creeper's leaf across
 Like a splash of blood, intense, abrupt,
 O'er a shield else gold from rim to boss,
 And lay it for show on the fairy-cupped,
 Elf-needed mat of moss,

"By the rose-flesh mushrooms, undivulged
 Last evening—nay, in to-day's first dew
 Yon sudden coral nipple bulged,
 Where a freaked fawn-colored crew
 Of toad-stools peep indulged."

He speaks, too, of the "love-apple lying pulpy and red on its bed of orchard's black mould"; of "gourds fried in great purple slices"; of the "prickly-pear's red flesh that leaves through its juice the stony black seeds on one's pearl-teeth"; of "pomegranates, red-ripe and chapping and splitting in halves on the tree," and of this wayside feast too tempting to be resisted:

"Last eve I rode over the mountains;
 Your brother, my guide,
 Soon left me, to feast on the myrtles
 That offered, each side,
 Their fruit-balls, black, glossy and luscious—
 Or strip from the sorbs
 A treasure; or, rosy and wondrous,
 Those hairy, gold orbs!"

Browning not only had the soul of a poet, but the eye of a painter—an Oriental painter. His delight in spring finds expression in many of his lines. His first reference to Nature is in the second stanza of his first poem, "Pauline," and it is a spring scene:

"Thou wilt remember one warm morn when winter
Crept aged from the earth, and spring's first breath
Blew soft from the moist hills; the blackthorn boughs,
So dark in the bare wood, when glistening
In the sunshine were white with coming buds,
Like the bright side of a sorrow, and the banks
Had violets opening from sleep like eyes."

Fifty-seven years later, in one of his last poems, Browning is still writing of the season he always seems to love best, "when shy buds venture out." Still another lovely, fragrant spring scene is given in "Sordello":

"'Twas a sunrise of blossoming and May.
Beneath a flowering laurel thicket lay
Sordello; each new sprinkle of white stars
That smell fainter of wine than Massic jars
Dug up at Baïæ, when the south wind shed
The ripest, made him happier."

Although Browning's beauty-loving, romantic nature was in character Italian rather than English, in "Home Thoughts" he records an outburst of homesick longing for the spring freshness of the colder climes, which, for the moment, all the perennial beauty of Italy could not excel:

"All will be gay when noontide wakes anew
The buttercups, the little children's dower,
Far brighter than this gaudy melon-flower."

Another spring scene, and that a Maytime one, is found in "Tl Inn Album," where an English elm in full beauty is prominent the foreground:

"the great elm in the open, posed
Placidly full in front, smooth bole, broad branch,
And leafage, one green plenitude of May.
* * * exceeding beauty, bosomful
Of lights and shades, murmurs and silences,
Sun-warmth, dew-coolness—squirrel, bee and bird,
High, higher, highest, till the blue proclaims
'Leave earth, there's nothing better till next step
Heavenward.'"

"With Gerard de Lairese" closes in a lyric, half-sad, half-joyful, on the tulip:

"Dance, yellows and whites and reds—
Lead your gay orgy, leaves, stalks, heads,
Astir with the wind in the tulip-beds!

"There's sunshine; scarcely a wind at all
Disturbs starved grass and daisies small,
On a certain mound by the churchyard wall.

"Daisies and grass be my heart's bedfellows
On the mound wind spares and sunshine mellows;
Dance you, reds and whites and yellows."

Not all Browning's pictures are of blossom-time, however; he has also painted autumn sketches full of color and far from gloomy. Perhaps his feeling for this season is best expressed in the words of Paracelsus:

"Nay, autumn wins you best by this, its mute
Appeal to sympathy for its decay;
Look up, sweet Michal, nor esteem the less
Your stained and drooping vines their grapes bow down,
Nor blame those creaking trees bent with their fruit,
That apple-tree with a rare after-birth
Of peeping blooms sprinkled its wealth among."

Browning loved to walk, far into the night, along tree-shaded paths, and perhaps it was in such strolls that he saw scenes similar to these:

"The moon came out: like features on a face,
A querulous fraternity of pines,
Sad blackthorn clumps, leafless and groveling vines,
Also came out, made gradually up
The picture";—"Sordello."

"The village elm
That holds the moon."—"Sordello."

"that tree with the thick top
That holds in all its leafy green and gold
The sun now like an immense egg of fire—
(It was a million-leaved mimosa)."

—"The Ring and the Book."

And in some daylight ramble he might have enjoyed the revelation he credits to another:

"As German Boehme never cared for plants
Until it happed, a-walking in the fields
He noticed all at once that plants could speak,
Nay, turned with loosened tongue to talk with him,
That day the daisy had an eye indeed—
Colloquized with the cowslip on such themes!"
—"Transcendentalism."

His favorite bit of scenery is pools and such sheltered spots of beauty. In "Pauline" he likens Shelley's lonely and withdrawn character to a quiet spring "scarce worth a moth's flitting, which long grasses cross and one small tree embowers lovingly." Then there is a woodland stream which trees bend over as "wild men watch a sleeping girl," and which tall rushes and thick flag-knots have combined to narrow. He dislikes the Mayne because it

"Bears not on its shaven ledge
Aught but weeds and waving grasses
To view the river as it passes,
Save here and there a scanty patch
Of primroses too faint to catch
A weary bee."

Best of all is that picture he paints for "Gerard de Lairese," with its afterthought of color to make it complete, a scene ready for some artist's brush and canvas:

"Deep in the hollow, rather, where combine
Tree, shrub and brier to roof with shade and cool
The remnant of some lily-strangled pool
Edged round with mossy fringing soft and fine.
Smooth lie the bottom slabs, and overhead
Watch elder, bramble, rose and service-tree,
And one beneficent rich barberry
Jewelled all over with fruit-pendants red."

For purposes of illustration, Browning has made good use of the vegetable kingdom. For instance, law is likened to an impartial mother in whose care

"the children light come and prompt go,
This, with a red-cheeked apple for reward,
The other, peradventure, red-cheeked too,
I' the rear, by taste of birch for punishment."

Solomon draws a lesson from the cedar and the hyssop:

"Aspire to the Best! but which? There are Bests and Bests to man
With a habitat each for each, earth's Best as much Best as any!
On Lebanon's roots the cedar—soil lofty, yet stony and sandy—
While hyssop, of worth in its way, on the wall grows low and
handy."

Rudel, to the Countess of Tripoli, compares himself to the faithful sunflower, whose over-fidelity has worked to its own detriment:

"A Flower I know,
(The Sun) cannot have perceived, that changes ever
At his approach; and in the lost endeavor
To live his life, has parted, one by one,
With all a flower's true graces, for the grace
Of being but a foolish mimic sun,
With ray-like florets round a disk-like face,
Men call the Flower the Sunflower, sportively."

Paracelsus, in expressing his failure to attain the highest ranges of knowledge, says:

"I hate no longer
The host of petty vile delights, undreamed of
Or spurned before; such as now supply the place
Of my dead aims; as in the autumn woods
Where tall trees used to flourish, from their roots
Springs up a fungus brood sickly and pale,
Chill mushrooms colored like a corpse's cheek."

In physical descriptions, he draws such parallels as: "apple-shaped head"; "quince-tint cheek"; "small face buoyant as the bellflower on its bed"; "mouth of geranium red"; "cheeks red as tomatoes"; "eyes dark and humid like the depth of lustre hid in the blubell"; "tresses sunnier than the wild-grape cluster"; "mouth split red-fig-wise" and womanhood "covered with as multiplied a coating as protects an onion from the eye."

Browning's knowledge of husbandry is preserved in the following:

"What wonder that the lady-rose I woo
And palisade about from every wind
Holds herself handsomely? The wilding, now,
Ruffled outside at pleasure of the blast,
That still lifts up with something of a smile
Its poor attempt at bloom."—"Mihrab Shah."

"To primrose, polyanthus I prefer,
As illustration, from the fancy-fact
That out of the simple came the composite
By culture; that the florist bedded thick
His primrose-root in ruddle, bullock's blood,
Until the pale and pure grew fiery-fine,
Ruby and topaz, rightly named anew."

—"Red Cotton Night-Cap Country."

"If field with corn ye fail preoccupy,
Darnel for wheat and thistle-beards for grain
Will grow apace, in combination prompt,
Defraud the husbandman of his desire."

—"The Ring and the Book."

"The grapes that dye thy wine are richer far
Through culture, than the wild wealth of the rock;
The suave plum than the savage-tasted drupe,
The flowers turn double, and the leaves turn flowers."

—"Cleon."

The pleasures of the table are not slighted. The homesick market girl in "Pippa Passes" longs for apples to eat—"deuzans, junetings, leather-coats." The poor poet in "How It Strikes a Contemporary" was happy with "three red halves of starved winter-pears or treat of radishes in April." One of the advocates in "The Ring and the Book" is much less interested in the case he is defending than in his eight-year-old son's birthday dinner, then in process of preparation; he thinks of the "liver's leathery slice with here a goose-foot and there a cock's-comb stuck," of the rabbit jugged with pine-pips; and he pauses in his argument to worry over a possible catastrophe in the coming feast:

"(May Gigia have remembered, nothing stings
Fried liver out of its monotony
Of richness, like a root of fennel, chopped
Fine with parsley; parsley-sprigs, I said—
Was there need I should say 'And fennel, too'?
But no, she cannot have been so obtuse!
To our argument! the fennel will be chopped!)"

And conger-eel, Browning records, should not be cooked "in oil and nettles, as man fries the foam-fish kind." His recipe for cooking ortolans makes the mouth water: each fatling dressed with plain bread and

"Then, a strong sage leaf:
(So we find books with flowers dried here and there
Lest leaf engage leaf.)"

—"Ferishtah's Fancies."

It makes one long to be in Italy just to try some of these "luscious lumps."

That Browning was a sincere nature-lover is revealed all through his works, and he has not hesitated to confess it openly:

"Many a thrill
Of kinship, I confess to, with the powers
Called Nature: animate, unanimate,
In parts or in the whole, there's something there
Man-like goes altogether with the heart
O' the Persian, that old Xerxes, when he stayed
His march to conquest of the world, a day
I' the desert, for the sake of one superb
Plane-tree which queened it there in solitude;
Giving her neck its necklace, and each arm
Its armlet, suiting soft waist, snowy side,
With cincture and apparel."

Truly, "Beatrice (Bice) Signorini" is but using the poet's own discriminating observation when she thus criticizes the flower-wreath painted by her rival:

"No adept
In florist's lore more accurately named
And praised or, as appropriately, blamed
Specimen after specimen of skill,
Than Bice. 'Rightly placed the daffodil—
Scarcely so right the blue germander. Gray
Good mouse-ear! Hardly your auricula
Is powdered white enough. It seems to me
Scarlet, not crimson, that anemone!
But there's amends in the pink saxifrage.'"

FLORAL MONUMENTS.

Hartley Coleridge discovered the secret of many a familiar plant name when he wrote, in his poem to the dandelion:

"Strange plants we bring from lands where Kaffirs roam,
And great the traveler in botanic fame
That can inflict his queer and ugly name
On product of South Afric sands or loam."

This very thing has been done time and again, not merely to South African discoveries, but in all new lands where botanists are at work. The dahlia, a native of Chili, perpetuates the name of Andrew Dahl, a Swedish botanist; the magnolia honors Pierre Magnol, an eminent French writer on botanical subjects; the *Gerardia* commemorates the memory of John Gerard, the famous and quaint English herbalist of the sixteenth century; the *kalmia* was christened by Linnæus after Peter Kalm, one of his pupils who traveled in this country and who was perhaps the first to make known this beautiful shrub to the great master; Linnæus selected the little twinflower ("*Linnæa borealis*"), a tiny blossom found plentifully in the pineries of North America, to bear his name:

"He saw beneath dim aisles, in odorous beds,
The slight *Linnæa* hangs its twin-born heads,
And blessed the monument of the man of flowers,
Which breathes his sweet fame through the northern bowers."
—Ralph Waldo Emerson ("*Wood Notes*").

In doing so Linnæus testified to his possession of that appreciation of the daintily beautiful and perfect which is supposed to be lacking in men of long scientific training, and that he had more than an ordinary fondness for the blossom is shown by the fact that he had portraits painted in which he wears "*boutonnieres*" of the delicate bells. A quaint tradition is given as to the origin of the dayflower's other name, *commelina*. It has two large, rounded petals of a delicate blue, and a third so inconspicuous in form and color that the casual observer often misses the petal altogether. There were three brothers Commelin, natives of Holland; two of them were noted botanists, while the third was but indifferently interested in the noble science. The genus was dedicated to the three; the two large bright petals commemorating the two famous brothers and the unpretentious one representing the indifferent brother. *Lobelia* is named in honor of an early French botanist, Mathieu Lobel, who was physician to King James I. (The great lobelia is sometimes humorously called "*highbelia*.") Other "*monuments to the men of flowers*" are wistaria, fuchsia, camellia, begonia, gardenia, zinnia, *eschscholtzia*, or California poppy—a complete list would number hundreds of names, some of them fully equal to Hartley Coleridge's adjectives.

Euphorbus, a Greek physician, is still remembered in the euphorbia, or spurge, and Eupator, king of Pontus, in the eupatorium; while Gentius, an Illyrian king, is said to have discovered the medicinal properties of the gentian. *Cinchona* gets its name from the wife of the Count Chinchon, Viceroy of Peru in the seventeenth century,

who by its use was freed from an intermittent fever and who after her return to Spain contributed to the general spread of this remedy. ("Quinine" is another Spanish name for the plant, or rather the medicine.) Culver's root is one of the many Indian remedies which were adopted by our forefathers; a Dr. Culver first prescribed or popularized it. Joe Pye is said to have been an Indian doctor who cured typhus fever in early New England times by means of the trumpet-weed, hence its other name, "Joe-pye-weed." Another Indian enjoying botanical fame is Sequoyah, or George Guess, a Cherokee half-breed who invented the Cherokee alphabet; his name, Latinized by some botanists into Sequoia, together with that of Washington, forms a book-term for the largest American vegetable, the "big tree" of California.

The name of the first President has been bestowed on several native plants: the Washington palm, of California; Washingtonia, a genus of American sweet cicelies; the Washington lily of the Pacific coast and the Washington thorn of the District of Columbia, though of course these latter reach his name indirectly through their habitat. The Jeffersonia, or twin-leaf; the clarkia (a Pacific slope evening-primrose named from the famous explorer), poinsettia and the clintonia are other plants bearing the names of historical characters. Of the last Thoreau complains: "Gray should not have named it from the Governor of New York. What is he to the lovers of flowers in Massachusetts? If named after a man, let it be a man of flowers. Name your canals and railroads after Clinton, if you please, but his name is not associated with flowers." The twigs of the pokeweed are said to have been plucked and worn by President Polk's followers during his campaign, and some would claim that the plant was named at that time; but the real origin is in the Indian *pocan*. It was probably due to the similarity in names that Polk's champions wore the plant. Captain Shaddock is said to have brought the first grape-fruit from the East Indies; there are two varieties, the pear-shaped and the round, the former properly being called shaddock and the latter grape-fruit or pomelo. Timothy, as will be suspected, is named in honor of its propagator; about 1720 Timothy Hanson carried the seed of this forage plant, known as herd's grass in Europe, from New England, where it had been introduced, to Maryland, where it was then unknown, and his dissemination of the valuable fodder caused it to be called after him. "Queen Anne's Laces" (the wild carrot) probably came into use during that monarch's reign, and is based on the cobwebby appearance of the blossomed umbels; "my lady's laces" is another name, and from the shape of the seeded stalks, it is also known as "bird's-nest."

"Radiant sunshine everywhere!
Now you'll find my Lady's laces
Spread like frostwork, filmy fair,
Over fields and open spaces
For the sun to bleach and whiten
As all lore housewifely pledges.
Each web wrought with daintiest care,
See the tiny mesh-dots brighten
Into wee blooms at its edges!
And that central symbol dark—
Ah, that is my Lady's mark,
As her own the weaves attesting."

—Sarah J. Day ("Wild Carrot").

Good King Henry probably commemorates the sentiment of some loyal subject; so does Victoria regia, that gigantic member of the water-lily family discovered in Africa and naturalized in many botanical gardens and city parks. Then, while not applied to any particular person, we have sweet William, bouncing Betty, ragged Robin, black-eyed Susan, nimble Will, and so on.

It has been said that the life of Christ throws its shadow over the whole vegetable world, so numerous are the legends relating to plants in religion. But, owing perhaps to a sense of reverence, very few plants bear the names of the Deity: God's-eye, Christ's-eye and Christ's thorn are three plants which bear no other name. The germander speedwell is sometimes called God's-eye, the ceiba is God-tree, the hartstongue fern is Christ's hair, the dove plant is Holy Ghost and the pansy is Herb-Trinity. This about completes the list. Some plants received their names from association with events in Christ's life, such as Star of Bethlehem, passion flower, sainfoin. On the other hand, upon the Virgin Mary has been lavished a wealth of flowers, many of the plants having the prefix "lady" or "our Lady" having been originally named in her honor. Blue-eyed Mary, costmary, virgin's bower, may have originated in the same way; rosemary, however, is a Latin combination of *ros*, dew, and *marinus*, marine. The lungwort is often called Joseph-and-Mary, and the goat's beard has another name in Joseph's flower. Many plants have become interwoven with the lives of the saints. St. John's wort is named from the Baptist, its leaves being marked with blood-like spots which appear, according to tradition, on the anniversary of his death. The wild carob was once known as St. John's bread, from a popular belief that he fed upon its seeds while in the wilderness. Samphire is derived from the French term *St. Pierre*, probably because it grows so near the water and even upon

it; the bridal wreath is also called St. Peter's wreath. The filbert is named in honor of St. Philibert, whose day, August 22, fell in the nutting season. Then there is herb Barbara, St. Barnaby's thistle, herb St. Christopher, St. John's lily, St. Anthony's nut (the ground nut, so called because St. Anthony was once a swineherd), St. George's mushroom: in short, a complete catalogue of flowers has been compiled, one for each day of the year, the flower in many cases having been selected because it blossoms on the festival of that saint. And there are Joseph's-coat, Jacob's-ladder, Aaron's rod, Adam and Eve, Job's tears, Adam's-needle-and-thread, and many another Biblical reference in the name and particularly in the pet name of many flowers. For such terms are often folk-names rather than botanical ones, flower-lovers, like fond parents and friends, being fond of coining new cognomens for their little favorites. Solomon's seal, however, came rightly by its name, which botanists accept in their book-term *Salomonina*, for the root-stocks are marked with large round scars left by the death and separation of the stout stalks of previous years, much like the impressions of a seal upon wax. In Europe the plant is called David's harp, from the exact similarity of the outline of the stalk, with its pendant bell-like blossoms, to the drawings of early times in which King David is represented as seated before an instrument shaped like the half of a pointed arch, from which are suspended metal bells which he strikes with two hammers. The Judas tree is said to be named from the betrayer's having hanged himself on a growth of this species; Shakespeare, however, declares that "Judas hanged himself on an elder," while Gerard maintains that it was the wild carob.

His Satanic Majesty, of course, has been well supplied with vegetable possessions. His hand is an ornamental Mexican tree with bright red flowers having five stamens arranged like fingers; his apron is a large seaweed with a flat, leathery structure somewhat like a smith's apron; his leaf is a stinging nettle; his tongue is a species of Jack-in-the-pulpit with a long spadix; his garter is the hedge bindweed; his grandmother is the tobacco weed; his thread is the clematis; his blacking is the mulberry; his shoe-strings are the goat's rue; his snuff is the puffball, when ripe; his oatmeal is the wild parsley, and so on. A host of plants are named or nicknamed for him, and he even contests with the Virgin and the saints the right to many plants: the bird's-foot-trefoil is called both lady's-fingers and devil's-fingers, while the orange hawkweed is both lady's paintbrush and devil's paintbrush.

Tradition claims that the yarrow, or *Achillea millefolium*, was used by Achilles to cure the wounds of his soldiers. The centaury

is named from the centaur Chiron, half horse and half man, that wise teacher to whom was confided the training of Hercules, Jason and Achilles, and who discovered the medicinal properties of the plant. The enchanter's nightshade, *Circaea lutetiana*, is a member of the harmless evening primrose family, and there is nothing in its appearance to suggest an enchanter or any of the nightshades; it seems that the name of a plant called after the enchantress Circe and described nearly 2,000 years ago, was accidentally transferred to this innocent plant. "Arethusa was one of the nymphs who attended Diana," says John Burroughs, "and was by that goddess turned into a fountain that she might escape the god of the river, Alpheus, who became desperately in love with her on seeing her at her bath.

Our Arethusa is one of the prettiest of the orchids, and has been pursued through many a marsh and quaking bog by her lovers." *Dianthus* means "Jove's flower," from the Greek *dios*, Zeus or Jove, and *anthus*, flower; this highest of all the gods is honored, under his Roman designation, in Jupiter's beard, Jupiter's staff (the common mullein), and Jupiter's eye (the houseleek). The queen of the gods has two plants, Juno's rose (the white garden lily) and Juno's tears (the common European vervain). The goddess of love fares better and has many a pretty floral namesake: Venus' bath is the common teasel, because the leaf that encircles the stem forms a tiny basin which collects rain and dew; Venus' flytrap is one of the insectivora; Venus' looking-glass is a member of the bluebell family with shell-shaped leaves that clasp the stalk so as to form little shallow cups, in the bottom of which three buds appear like tiny reflections. Venus' comb and Venus' slipper are other names for lady's comb and lady'slipper, for in the times of the Reformation the good Puritans, who did not wish to have Catholic names for their common flowers, took many of "Our Lady's" flowers away from her and gave them to the pagan Venus instead. Herb-Paris, supposed to be poisonous, is fitly named for the Paris who caused the disastrous Trojan War; Hercules' Club is a gourd sometimes five feet in length and seemingly appropriate for a giant's weapon; Calypso, Agave, Mercury, Adonis, Iris, Althaea, Syrinx, Narcissus, Andromeda and Hyacinth are other living proofs that this world once had a golden age when it was peopled by gods and superhuman mortals.

"His form Narcissus in the stream yet views,
In snowy vest, but fringed with purple glare."

—Angelo Poliziano.

"And in his blood, that on the ground lay spilled,
A purple flower sprung up, checquer'd with white;
Resembling well his pale cheeks, and the blood
Which in round drops upon their whiteness stood.

—Shakespeare: "Venus and Adonis."

"And Pan did after Syrinx speed
Not as a nymph, but for a reed."

—Andrew Marvell.

"pitying the sad death
Of Hyacinthus, when the cruel breath
Of Zephyr slew him."—John Keats.

HARRIETTE WILBUR.

Duluth, Minn.

SOME PHASES OF GAELIC SPIRITUALITY.

HERE is no need of profuse argument to establish as an acceptable fact the prominence of the spiritual element in the character of the Gael. Any one equipped with even an elemental sense of honesty can follow with ease the trail of glory that marks the soul-progress of the Irish nation throughout its history. Long before the high ethics of the great Teacher of Israel came to it the literature and customs that it created were resplendent with the light that lives in a subtle appreciation of the true and beautiful, a lofty and elaborate code of chivalry and a striking predilection for things beyond the ken of sense. As Renan, one of the greatest of modern Celts, informs us, the moulding hand of nature gave to the beliefs and aspirations of the pagan Gael a considerable Christian coloring. The fifteen centuries that tell the story of his life after Patrick's advent to his land and his unique martyrdom for the things of the spirit are luminous with a brilliancy that no eye can exclude save that which ignorance has veiled or prejudice has darkened. Hence in this paper we are not concerned with the needless task of throwing a searchlight on what is evident: we take for granted the intense spirituality of the Irish race, now as in the past, and propose to concern ourselves with some modes of spiritual expression that have appealed to us as especially deserving of notice.

In Ireland a certain continuity of expression so characterizes the religious thought of the people that the invisible world invests with the penetrating and enveloping power of an atmosphere all the nooks and crannies of humblest life as well as the commanding mountain summits where dignity and refinement are established. A respect that pertains more to what is childlike than to what is official is tendered to the Creator. The morning prayer that ushers in the gleam and gloom of each day's varied story and the rosary call to Mary that heralds the rest of sunless hours clamor with as natural an appeal at the portals of the Irish heart as that instinctive voice that calls for the sustenance of corporal vitality. But linking those golden exits and entrances of the hours of work and ease is what Robert Hugh Benson once called a kind of spiritual atmosphere that dominates with an almost ever-present force the conscious hours of the individual. The word atmosphere seems very appropriate to express this religious attitude, for like the physical element it is an intangible, passive-like something that the stranger alone can notice as unusual, that the native takes for granted as most ordinary and that only some exciting force can make manifest what fires of beauty it holds latent within its silent bosom. And when from those quiet depths leap forth those flash signs of an intensely

BOSTON COLLEGE
FATHERS' REC. ROOM
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

spiritual world the great magnet that gives freedom and direction to their energy is the vivid conception of an ever-watchful Providence that is ever ready to give a transforming glory to the tear and a chastened loveliness to the smile. Yet with that fire of fervor and sincerity there is always coupled an astonishing simplicity. When the heart of the Gael gives birth to a prayer its crowning beauty is simplicity, for the Irish soul holds close commune with nature and through it with a God who is essentially devoid of complexity. Thus does it come to pass that the votaries of Him who proclaimed the superiority of the least pretentious of the flowers of the field over a Solomon clad in all the complex magnificence that human power could bestow find nothing sufficiently commonplace to exclude the thought of God. The daily greeting of the Irishman to his fellow-man enshrines a benediction such as: "God and Patrick bless you." A house is never entered without a preliminary blessing on all who dwell therein. The dignity and sanctity of work are recognized by the bestowal of a like greeting upon the laborer in the field. The dead, those dear departed ones, whom the Gael's strong sense of kinship can never hand over to oblivion, find the mention of their names always mated with a heartfelt prayer for their abiding rest. Evil happenings are seldom related without the accompanying request of heaven that all who hear the direful news may suffer no such woe. And when sorrow becomes personal it rarely materializes the Irishman's conception of life and the exalted destiny of a human soul, for with a sense of heroic resignation he exclaims: "God's will be done." He seems to be sustained by a sense of destiny, an unswerving fealty to the belief in an immortality to come, a belief which Renan and more recently Colum have branded as decidedly Gaelic, that makes him see beneath the darkest cloud the latent sunshine of the Father's promise that for the tried and true sorrows shall one day cease.

And yet despite the fact that faith in the unseen is so intimately part and parcel of the national feeling, the Irish people are not consciously demonstrative in matters of religion. There seems to be a strong element of conservatism in the Irish character which, coupled with its clinging love of tradition, calls for a protective veil secrecy to shield the precious ancestral treasure of faith within the sanctuary of the heart. Evidence of this seems to exist in a relative neglect for ceremonial. The Irish people have not consigned to the grave that lack of interest in concrete expressions of devotion that lived with them in the twilight of their Druidic days. For even in that infant stage of national development, when it is usual for the primitive mentality of peoples to demand materialistic methods of worship, the Irish conception of divine beings was rarely actualized

in idolatrous practices, whilst no priestly class like that of Greece or Rome could claim the support of the nation for merely sacerdotal activity. And in these Christian days religion preserves the same tendency to bloom and blush as rose unseen in the secret garden of the heart. To-day its retiring nature is perhaps not only the resultant of the racial shyness so characteristic of all the Celtic races, but also of the lash of time's reverses which whipped the children of the Gael into relative social and political isolation from the rest of Europe and drove the Mass, their premier mode of external worship of the Deity, into the lone and hidden places of their land. In marked contrast with the Catholic countries of Continental Europe, there are no wayside shrines with their simple, yet picturesque appeal to the religious instinct of the passer-by. To the sacred wells of their lands the people still flock to honor the memory of the saints, but are content with the most primitive adornments to bear testimony to the sanctity of these localities. Then the Irish are long-memoried and still tribal in their instincts, and any custom that the sacred name of their fathers has hallowed, even though it be the offspring of alien injustice, they adhere to with unparalleled tenacity. For instance, though anti-religious laws no longer exist and every parish owns its own church the people like to maintain the custom that was once a necessity of having the Mass offered up within the simple precincts of their homes. In these surroundings the Holy Sacrifice does not present as powerful an appeal to sense as within the stately church, but it carries with it bitter-sweet memories of the Golgotha of the race that clamor loudly at the gates of the soul and penetrate the religio-national heart with a cogency that no pomp of ceremony could command.

Descending from religion to folk-lore we find much to convince us of how fascinating some of the channels of Irish spirituality are. Here, however, we have only space to refer to the popular tradition on fairydom which is one of the most poetic and attractive features of national belief. Those frolicsome sprites whom the fancy of the Gael so cherishes and who perhaps captivated the genius of Shakespeare himself, are creatures that he meets as intimates in the world of his imagination. These immaterial beings he accepts with as much confidence and discusses with as human an interest as if the hardest facts of history hammered the truth of their existence into his intelligence. One vein of tradition informs him that they are the remnants of that primitive race, the Tuatha De Danaan, whom defeat forced from the land of Erin to the hidden recesses of the underworld. Thus is an affinity established between him and them, for the latter are a spiritualized people of Ireland who loved the land too passionately to leave it forever and whom the chivalrous

affection of their conquerors consigned to underground Erin, where their joyous spirits might hold perennial revels and still take an interest in the life of the Gael. Another theory, not so national in inspiration, but still showing the love of the Irish for the world of fairy, endeavors to rescue them from the fate of evil spirits and maintains that they are those hosts that were neutral when Michael struggled with the satellites of Lucifer. Even in this doctrine there is a latent sense of pride of land, for those former denizens of heaven are represented as finding consolation in the scenic glories of the western isle. But whatever may be the respective merits, be they fairies Tuatha or doubting angels, as strictly spiritual existences sharing in the territorial property of Ireland they can only be the creation of a people who feel at home with the unseen and like the intimate companionship of beings who convey a poetry and fascination to the popular imagination that no artificial book-lore could confer. It is because of this feeling of familiarity that the people have Gaelicized the hosts of fairy as they have done to every stranger they have permanently admitted to their land and have made them live a life alike in all things to that of mortals save in sadness. The fairies oftentimes fall in love with some of the beautiful ones of earth and once the eye of mortal falls on the witching form of a handsome sprite, no skill of human being can quench the hunger of desire in that benighted heart till it find a resting-place beside its spirit-lover. They love the plaintive croon and the thrilling strains of their goblin bagpipes. They dance with elfish glee the reels and hornpipes of the Celt. With unchecked vigor and ecstasy of wildness they whirl their tiny hurling sticks in fields of midnight frolic. With buckler, shield and spear for sheer love of the delirium of the combat in countless numbers beneath the watching moon they taste the wild joy of battle while death's dread spectre can never stalk amongst their clashing ranks. When night comes on and mortals seek their rest true amity demands that they bequeath the freedom of the hearth and home to the visiting fairies of the hours of darkness. A strange spirit of familiarity with the unseen world dominates the preparations for the reception of the invisible guests, a spirit which Dora Sigerson admirably reveals in her pensive little lyrics. The floor is swept for the nocturnal revelers; the fire must retain its life and the hearth around it be clean and inviting; and that they may suffer no inconvenience all cooking utensils must be at hand.

Oftentimes, indeed, they are dreaded as well as cherished, but even then fear does not doom to death that sense of familiarity that links the terrestrial Gael to the world of fairy. When sometimes the pranks they play upon mortals embody more that is serious than

humorous, the "good people" they are called in conciliatory mood, that their deliberate enmity may not be aroused and they may be aware of feeling of brotherhood for them amongst the Gaels. And from a spirit of fear as well as admiration a veritable fairy topography has been created where countless features of the physical world are for the faint of heart as so many warning signals that in their neighborhood weird things occur, though to those whose hunger for the wonder-world has quelled the coward within them they extend an uncanny fascination. Cairns, cromlechs, fords, solitary thorn trees and glens that shun the light contribute to the belief in an unseen world and constitute no unimportant element of that immaterialism of outlook that is so distinctly Irish.

Passing from the domain of spirit to that of physical nature we find in the latter sphere a fascinating source of spiritual nourishment for the Irish people. Some ethnologists of repute lay special emphasis on climatic and geographical conditions as factors in the formation of national individuality. They would feign have us believe that towering mountains, dreaming valleys, whispering rivulets, meditative lakes, azure depths of sky and other such expressions of nature's countenance can color and mould to an appreciable extent a people's common heritage of ideas. This theory as a key to the mystery of race has often been challenged and seemingly with remarkable success. The influence of climatic conditions on the psychology of a nation is oftentimes exaggerated and confused with other moulding forces. When, however, the observation of such influences is limited to one country, especially one so sparse in territory and so isolated as Ireland, we believe that conclusions may be attained with a considerable degree of likelihood. Taking into account the question of climatic influence upon Irish character, the writer has been for a long time convinced that in this particular it has been very considerable. This we believe to be especially true where the spiritual and introspective bent of the people has to be estimated.

Renan has said that a characteristic of the Celtic races is an overmastering desire to penetrate the unknown. Did Providence ever place a people in a sphere more stimulating for those in quest of the mystic than within the shores of Ireland and beneath the skies of the Gael? That grayness of landscape and heavens that is so vividly mirrored in Gaelic sagas and ancient tales and that Lady Gregory claims to have so powerfully influenced the character of the Irish must assuredly be a constant challenge to the curious instinct of those who gaze so often into its mystery-laden depths. Its very indefiniteness calls out to the human mind ever hot on the trail of the unsolved to dream of worlds and things that belong to

the measureless in duration and extension. That Irish sky which Seumas O'Sullivan calls "the symbol of the unattainable" and yet holds something of promise to be attained implies in its very grayness a transition stage between gleam and gloom that must within the realm of thought link the things that are luminous with earthly light with those that shine behind heaven's curtain of secrecy. That misty vagueness that so prevails in the ancient and modern literary coloring of the Gael and sometimes in the artist's canvas, as in that of John Yeats's sombre landscapes, may go a long way towards explaining the Irish love of dawn and twilight hours. These mystic stages of struggling shade and light find the mind restful and receptive, and send it journeying along the road that links the things of sense perception with the things that the soul demands. Those skies produce an impression of envelopment: they seem to cling to heaven and yet stoop down to fold you in their misty embrace, making you a part of themselves while yet your feet feel the clinging power of earth. They combine an illusory concreteness with a spirit shapelessness that seems to bridge the abyss between spirit and matter and make their respective mysteries in some way the property of one another. The observer becomes as much a part of them as those characters of Seumas O'Kelly's "Waysiders" are of the enveloping atmosphere in which they live. Well do I remember how as a boy the strange clouds that rested on the mountains were the object of my youthful wonder and it seemed to me that could I find myself within their magic circle the secrets of the skies would certainly be mine. For these hovering, clinging mists seemed to hold communion with the hidden wonders of the heavens whilst equally determined to keep their grip upon the stable, though soaring elevations of our planet.

Add to this aspect of a land and sky the surprising sense of quiet that invades the soul of the constant dweller in Ireland and you cannot wonder that where such silence reigns mysticism tends to develop. An American who never saw Ireland until he was a young man and who had little or no traditions to render him susceptible to its imaginative influences once told the writer that the almost vocal silence of the night time was one of the lasting impressions that he carried away from the western island. It is such a silence as that in which "A. E.," master of the Dublin mystics, finds the mysteries of the spheres and the music of the unutterable. It is for the most part unbroken by the clangor of large industrial cities, the uproar and commercialism of which so distract and dull the visionary keenness of souls. Life has not become as artificial and mechanical as in other lands, but is still close to the nurturing breast of nature, whence it drinks in the science of the truth and

beauty and goodness that dwell in the smallest things of creation as well as in cosmic magnitudes. No materialistic civilization has muffled the spiritual ear and rendered it insensible to the heart-throbs of a universe that are distinct and appealing to receptive and attuned faculties. Finally the Gael is favored in this respect at least by the fact of geographical isolation. The Irish share with all the Celts the common fate of material defeat: they have been driven from the disturbing Babel of European noise into their island refuge in the extreme west, where study of self is a striking necessity and compulsory introspection reveals in bold relief the great features of existence and of destiny.

It is the fervent belief and hope of the writer that the future holds no real peril for the spiritual life of Ireland. It has stood the test of as terrible an ordeal as the history of persecution can furnish. It has not only been self-sustaining, but has contributed one of the most vital factors making for the continuity of national life. The nurturing sap of its influence has entered all the arteries of its civilization, making it refined and wholesome in its halcyon days and giving it a resisting calibre of heroic mould in the age of decline. It is not likely to droop and die beneath the nipping frosts of prosperity, for the lure of material gain was often held before the inspired eyes of Ireland and never enticed her from the strongholds of fidelity to her visions. Her empire has been essentially one of the spirit and the principles that governed her past furnish a magnificent guarantee of loyalty to the sceptre of the soul in the future.

JAMES F. CASSIDY.

New York, N. Y.

OLD-TIME PUNISHMENTS AND ORDEALS.

PUNISHMENTS came into the world with the fall of our first parents and their banishment from Paradise. Since that time it has always followed real or imaginary offense against established law. The original idea of punishment was the infliction of pain on the offender in proportion to the amount of suffering or pain he had entailed upon others through his offense. Out of this grew the *lex talionis*, or retaliatory idea of punishment, which required "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." Christianity was not slow in discovering that vindictiveness or the infliction of pain as a satisfaction for an offense was not the true end of punishment. Punishment was to prevent future offenses, not to avenge the past. The interest of society demands its security from the injury to person or property occasioned by crime and the moral and religious improvement of the criminal. This security of society has been sought for in several ways, viz.: by forcibly preventing the offender from repeating the offense, as by death, mutilation or imprisonment; by reforming the habits of the offender and directing his thoughts into proper channels, by deterring him from the repetition of his crime through fear of greater and more severe punishment, and finally, by making the consequences of violation of law so terrible as to deter others from following in the way of old offenders.

In our day this way of looking at things has undergone some very radical, and we may say, ridiculous, if not criminal changes in the minds of certain persons who, consciously or unconsciously, are trying to counteract the aims of justice. Witness that class of sentimental damsels who rush to the murderer's cell with flowers and dainties, but who never give a thought to the mourning family of his victim. Witness those parents who over-indulge their own children, but whose stock of anathemas is not sufficient with which to overwhelm the children of other people who may have been guilty of the same impropriety as their own. To these we may add the political reasons that too often influence some of our magistrates when called upon to sentence offenders, especially around election times. We have seen cases of this during the war just closed.

In our day, too, there are not wanting sympathetic Christian souls who, unthinkingly, call upon the world to "forget and forgive" the atrocities committed during the late war, forgetting that God's justice is as perfect as His mercy.

Capital punishment—so called because the head (Latin *caput*),

from being the most vital, is generally that part of the body which it acted on—goes back to a very early period. We find numerous instances of it in Sacred Scripture and it prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans. Plutarch tells us that under the Draconian law “for nearly all crimes there was the same penalty of death.” The man who was convicted of idleness (the I. W. W. of our day, for instance) or who stole a cabbage or an apple was liable to death, no less than the robber of temples or the murderer. Nor must we imagine that such a severe penalty for slight offenses was confined to Draco and his day. Death was, in former times, in England the usual punishment for all felonies and the certain doom of those who were not protected by the Benefit of Clergy.

The Common Law inflicted death on every felon *who could not read*, and the law implied the punishment when the statute made any offense a felony. Then, again, the many acts of Parliament creating felonies, with Benefit of Clergy* show that the statute law was still more bloodthirsty, for four-fifths of the one hundred and sixty offenses referred to by Blackstone as punishable with death had been made so during the reigns of the first three Georges. It may be interesting for us to mention some of the offenses which came under the sentence of death. Stealing in a dwelling-house to the amount of forty shillings; stealing privately, in a shop, goods of the value of five shillings; counterfeiting stamps that were used for the sale of *perfumery*; doing the same with the stamps used for the certificates for *hair powder*. An analysis of these laws will cause a smile on the faces of the people of to-day. The modern view of capital punishment has a twofold object: First, to deprive the dangerous man of a life that might again find itself bent on

*Benefit of Clergy (*privilegium clericale*) grew out of the regard paid by Christian princes to the Church and consisted of: “First, an exemption of places consecrated to religious uses from criminal arrest, which was the foundation of sanctuaries; second, exemption of the persons of clergymen from criminal process before the secular judge, in particular cases, which was the original meaning of the *privilegium clericale*. In the course of time, however, the benefit of clergy extended to every one who could read, which was considered a great proof of learning, and it was enacted that there should be a prerogative allowed to the clergy, that if any man who could read were to be condemned to death, the Bishop of the diocese might, if he would, claim him as a cleric and dispose of him in some place of the clergy as he might deem meet. The Ordinary gave the prisoner a Latin book in black Gothic characters, from which to read a verse or two, and, if the Ordinary said, “*Legit ut clericus*,” the offender was only burnt in the hand; otherwise he suffered death. (Edward I., 1274.) The privilege was restricted by Henry VII. in 1489, and abolished with respect to murderers and other criminals by Henry VIII., 1512.—Stow.

mischievous; next, to warn those whose tendencies are similar that their end would lead to disgrace, but in this country the punishment that follows crime (when it does) is so snail-paced that the culprit and his crime are forgotten before the sentence is carried out. Then, again, the "dike" of crime is allowed to gain too much headway before any serious attempt is made to stay its course. The dread of violating the rights of *liberty* culminates in the speedy development of *license*. This point demands the most serious consideration of the American people at this time more than ever before. It is well known that there are dangerous characters, in high places, "representing" the people, who need watching—and silencing for their country's good.

It was because of the deterrent effect that is supposed to reside in the taking of life that Moses tabulated his series of punishments by death which sound strangely in the ears of the people of to-day. In his code of crimes the death sentence followed such apparently trivial offenses as eating leavened bread during the Passover; suffering an unruly ox to be at liberty; compounding holy ointment or selling the same to any stranger; the violation of the Sabbath; any act of violence towards one's father or mother; eating the fat of beasts that had been consecrated; blasphemy, and even the approach of the tabernacle by a stranger. In our own country down to 1650 the list of offenses punished with death was quite elaborate. In that year, in the colony of Massachusetts, the list had diminished until it contained only idolatry, witchcraft, blasphemy, murder, manslaughter, poisoning, stealing, false witness, treason, cursing and smiting of parents, rebellious sons, and, of course, Quakers, whose tongues and ears were split, and the terrible Jesuits, who returned after banishments. This list was reduced to its lowest terms in 1720, and now it enumerates only treason, murder, burglary and arson. The modes by which the punishment is inflicted vary in every country, from the primitive method of beating the culprit with clubs until life is extinct up to the application of the swift messenger electricity, that does the work almost as quickly and subtly as human thought.

Beheading, the *decollatio* of the Romans, was introduced into England from Normandy by William the Conqueror in 1070, when Walthrop, Earl of Huntington, Northampton and Northumberland, was the first so executed. Since that time this mode of execution became frequent, particularly during the reign of Henry VIII., who found it a convenient way and a more expeditious way than divorce of getting rid of some of his wives. Kings, queens and nobles and ecclesiastics of all grades have perished upon the block in England. Among these may be mentioned Sir Thomas More

(St.), 1535; Mary Queen of Scots, 1589; Charles I., 1649; Anne Boleyn, 1536; Lady Jane Grey, 1554; the Blessed John Cardinal Fisher, 1535, and many others, too numerous to mention. Beheading is of ancient date and was certainly known among the Greeks and Romans. Xenophon tells us that the losing of the head was looked upon as a most honorable death. The decollation, as it was called, of St. John the Baptist proves the existence of this punishment among the Jews under the Roman Governor of Judea. Suetonius says that Caligula kept an artist in beheading, who decapitated prisoners in his presence, brought indiscriminately for that purpose from the jails.

Among the Chinese beheading has long been a mode of inflicting punishment, but the manner of administering it differs from that common in European countries. In some cases the criminal is carried to the place of execution in a bamboo cage, and by his side is the basket in which his head will drop when removed. He is pinioned in a very effective manner. The middle of a long, thin rope is passed across the back of his neck and the ends are crossed on his chest and brought under the arms. They are then twisted round the arms, the wrists tied together behind the back and the ends fastened to the portion of the rope on the back. A slip of paper containing his name, crime and sentence is fixed to a reed and fastened at the back of his head. On arriving at the place of execution, the officials remove the paper and take it to the presiding Mandarin, who writes on it in red ink the warrant for the execution. The paper is then replaced, a rope loop is passed over the head of the culprit and the end given to an assistant, who draws the head forward so as to stretch the neck, while a second assistant holds the body from behind, and in a moment the head is severed from the body. The instrument employed is a sword made expressly for the purpose. It is a two-handed weapon, very heavy, and has a very broad blade. The executioners pride themselves on their dexterity in its management. After the execution the culprit's head is taken away and generally hung up in a bamboo cage near the scene of the crime and with a label bearing the name and offense of the criminal. In some cases neither ropes nor assistants are required at executions, the Chinese having very little fear of death. Indeed cases are known in which criminals have purchased substitutes for capital punishment. In China the headsman and indeed the generality of the inferior officers of justice are selected from the soldiery, according to the custom of primitive barbarians; neither is this employment considered more ignominious than the office of

sheriff in times gone by in our own country nor that of electrocutor to-day.

In France the guillotine has been the most usual mode of decapitation. This instrument was invented about the year 1785 by Joseph Ignace Guillotin as a more sure and less painful means of inflicting the punishment of death. During the Revolution Guillotin ran some risk of losing his life by his own "petard," but contrary to prevailing opinion he escaped and lived to be one of the founders of the Academy of Medicine at Paris, and died in 1814, greatly respected. The guillotine consists of two upright pieces of wood fixed in a horizontal frame, a sharp blade of steel moves up and down by means of a pulley in grooves in the two uprights; the edge of this blade is oblique instead of horizontal. The criminal is laid on his face, his neck immediately under the blade, which, descending, removes the head at a blow from the body. Among the most prominent victims who perished upon this terrible scaffold may be mentioned Louis XVI. and his Queen, Marie Antoinette, in 1793; Madame Roland and Charlotte Corday, also in 1793, and Robespierre, in 1794.

Blinding, by consuming the eyeballs with lime or vinegar, was a punishment inflicted anciently upon adulterers, perjurers and thieves. We read in Holy Scripture that as far back as 3283 B. C. an Assyrian King invaded Samaria and carried the Israelites away as captives. These unfortunates had their eyes put out with burning irons in the very presence of the king seated on his throne. Marmontel and Florian describe the heroic Belisarius, a general of the Emperor Justinian, as having been blinded by order of the Emperor, but this has been pronounced mythical by more than one reputable historian. The same may be said of Shakespeare, who in his "King John" gives a most pathetic scene in which Prince Arthur pleads for his eyes, which were to be burned out with hot irons. King John had enough to answer for without having this crime saddled upon him by the Bard of Avon. It has been said of him that "foul as it is, hell is defiled by the fouler presence of John." All Christendom believe him guilty of the murder of the young Prince Arthur, his nephew, and it is well known that "his punishments were the refinements of cruelty"—the starving of children, the crushing of men under copes of lead, but the blinding of the young Prince with hot irons, though perhaps not beyond his conception, cannot be held against him. In the Middle Ages this punishment was frequently changed from total blindness to diminution of sight. When in 1014 the Emperor Basil captured 15,000 Bulgarian prisoners, he caused their eyes to be put out, leaving one eye only

to every hundredth man, to enable him to conduct his countrymen home.

Boiling to death was made a capital punishment in England by statute 22, Henry VIII. (1531). This act was occasioned by seventeen persons having been poisoned by John Roose, the Bishop of Rochester's cook. Two of his victims died. Margaret Davis, a young woman, suffered in the same manner for a similar offense in 1542. Those condemned to this sort of punishment were subjected to the process in boiling water, boiling oil (considered in Japan as "something lingering"), molten lead and sulphur. We read in the "Acts of the Martyrs" that more than one Christian was "smothered in the heating room" in Rome in the reign of the Emperor Domitian. The beloved disciple, St. John, was one of them. In the middle of the thermæ, even in private baths, there was always a large basin of circular form, styled *caldarium*, surrounded by some steps, wherein was placed a reservoir of water incessantly heated by subterranean flames which surrounded the sides. "The temperature of that bath," Seneca tells us, "is such that any great criminal might be condemned to be scalded therein alive." The torture which the Emperor reserved for St. John consisted in his being plunged into a caldron of "boiling oil" or merely of boiling water, as St. Gregory of Nyssa interprets it. But the saint did not find his death in this manner. According to the words of Bossuet, "the fiery, seething mass suddenly changed into a gentle dew." All the orders of the prætor, all the rage of the executioners were powerless to rekindle the furnace, and like the eagle, St. John came forth from the flames rejuvenated and renewed, *renovabitur ut aquila juvenus tua*. This event took place about A. D. 96, the eleventh year of the reign of Domitian.

Burning alive was inflicted by the Romans, Jews and other nations on betrayers of councils, incendiaries and for incest. Many persons were burned alive on account of religious principles. The ancient Britons punished heinous crimes by burning alive in wicker baskets. The first to suffer in England was Sir William Sawtre, parish priest of St. Osynth, London (III. Henry IV.), February 9, 1401. Bartholomew Legget and Edward Wightman were burned at the stake for heresy in 1612 by warrant of James I. St. Joan of Arc was burned at the stake in the market place at Rouen in May, 1431, by order of her British captors. Joan of Arc was inspired to do the work heaven laid out for her to do, and her triumph attests the energy of her inspiration. Her mission was simply the bursting into action of patriotic faith guided from on high. She lived in it and she died through it, and was lighted to victory and to heaven

by the flame of her enthusiasm as well as the flame of her funeral pyre—her memory survived her martyrdom and she was deified by the Christian element of her country.

Burning alive was the punishment in colonial times for petty treason and murder of a master by a slave. Many were thus burned in all the colonies from Massachusetts to Carolina, and during the short period that Virginia claimed authority in Illinois she disgraced the Mississippi Valley by introducing this form of punishment. Another mode of burning alive, or rather of roasting alive, prevailed among the Chinese. It is known as Pao-lo and was invented by the Emperor Tchcon at the instigation of his favorite concubine, Takiya. The instrument for this punishment was a brass cylinder twenty cubits in height by eight in diameter, with openings at the bottom like a grate. Criminals had their arms and legs fastened around this cylinder, the fires were lighted within and the unfortunate victims were roasted in this manner until they were reduced to ashes. Father Duhalde, a missionary long resident in China and who describes this punishment, says that Takiya made it an occasion of great merry-making. Another and somewhat similar punishment practiced among the Chinese was a coil of snakes. These coils are, or were, of soft metal fashioned in the shape of snakes with open mouths. They were coiled round the naked limbs and body of the sufferer; boiling water was then poured into them, producing the most horrible torture, ending in death.

One of the most barbarous and unheard-of punishments is that known as the "illuminated body." Sefi II., Shah of Persia, who assumed the title of Solomon, indulged to an excess in strong drinks, and when under their influence resorted to the most diabolical cruelties. At an early age he gave evidences of his cruel disposition. In the early part of his reign he took a sudden notion that one of his favorites, whom he held in great esteem, should be married forthwith to some low-born man of the people. The first man that came in sight was the son of the court laundryman, and the marriage took place there and then. The former favorite was well pleased with her bargain and the couple lived happily together for some time. Finally the court laundryman died and his son asked to become his father's successor. The Shah sent for him and asked: "When thou didst marry this beautiful maiden by my command, what didst thou do in the way of a celebration?" "O mighty Prince," answered the young man, "I am a poor man and could ill afford an illumination." "What?" exclaimed the Shah, "the dog had no illumination over his great good fortune! Let an illumi-

nation be made with his body!" The poor fellow was immediately stretched out upon a slab and fastened to it. Innumerable little holes were bored all over his body; these were filled with oil, a little taper was set in each hole and they were all lighted together. It is needless to add that the poor victim perished in the most unspeakable agony.

Burying alive was a mode of punishment adopted in Bœotia, where Creon ordered Antizone, the sister of Polynices, to be buried alive in 1225 B. C. The Roman Vestals were subjected to it for levity that excited suspicion of their chastity. At the extremity of the Quirinal, between the Colline gate and the place where later on stood the famous garden of Sallust, was the Campus Sceleratus, or accursed field. Here was a subterranean chamber in which the guilty priestess was buried alive. Stretched out upon a bier, covered over with heavy drapery to stifle her cries, she was borne in mournful procession across the Forum, through the silent crowd, to the vault, in which was placed a bed, a lighted lamp, some bread, a little water, milk and oil—provisions for one day in that eternal prison—given, not in mercy for the poor victim, but the mocking help of a piety unwilling to acknowledge to Vesta the murder of one of her virgins. When the funeral train had reached the fatal vault the high priest offered up silent prayers; then the bier was uncovered and the victim, wrapped in her white veil, as in a shroud, descended by a ladder into her tomb, which was speedily covered up by slaves. The earth above was soon leveled so that no trace might be found of the place where, in the darkness of the tomb, the guilty Vestal had expiated her crime. Nor did her punishment end here.

No libations, which even the poorest Roman offered to the Manes, were made here. The unfortunate maiden was cut off from the world of the living and of the dead. The spectators, after the carrying out of the sentence, slowly and silently dispersed, deeply impressed by the terrible punishment visited upon a young and beautiful girl, and grateful for the greater evils averted from their capital by this propitiatory sacrifice. The Vestals burned alive on a charge of incontinence were Minutia, 337 B. C.; Sextilla, 274 B. C.; Cornelia, A. D. 92. The public maintenance of the Vestal virgins and the worship of Vesta were discontinued by Gratianus, A. D. 382.

Lord Bacon gives instances of the resurrection of persons who had been buried alive; the famous Duns Scotus is of the number. It seems almost incredible that, not satisfied with interring the condemned, some barbarous tribes buried to the hips or shoulders,

packing the earth firmly in, and left their victim helpless to meet a lingering death of exposure and starvation.

Hanging is and has been the mode of capital punishment employed in England and America. In its simplest form, that of suspending the criminal by a rope around his neck from the branch of a tree, it must have been of very early origin. Accounts vary as to the date of the introduction of the gallows as the instrument. We read in the Book of Esther (vii., 10), that "Aman (Haman) was hanged on the gibbet which he had prepared for Mordochai." (A. M. 3494.) Hanging seems to have been introduced into the Roman dominions soon after the Emperor Constantine abolished crucifixion. An early form of the gallows or gibbet seems to have been a crude imitation of a tree—a tall post bearing at its top a projecting beam, from the end of which the fatal cord could be suspended. In the fifteenth century the gallows beam balanced, like that of a pair of scales, at the top of the post, from one end of which depended the halter and from the other a heavy weight. When the rope was passed down and put around the offender's neck the weight at the other end lifted him from the ground. A form of hanging very usual in England when the gallows was in use as far back as the thirteenth century consisted in two upright posts, connected at the top by a cross beam, from which the rope was suspended. This form prevailed in the United States. In employing the gallows, the offender was, in early times, taken to the place of execution in a cart, which, after the halter had been adjusted, was driven from under the beam, leaving the victim to fall as far as the slack in the rope permitted. This was the case in the execution of the American patriot, Nathan Hale, of Revolutionary fame. In more recent times a similar fall was secured either by attaching a weight much heavier than the human body to the other end of the fatal rope, which, passing through a wheel at the beam, pulled the body upward some feet, when the weight was released; or by permitting the prisoner to stand on a trap door or platform while the rope was adjusted; the trap was then opened and the victim fell through it to the end of the rope's length.

Hanging, drawing and quartering seems to have been a favorite form of punishment in England during the reigns of Henry VIII., Elizabeth and James I. It is said to have been first inflicted upon William Marise, a pirate, a nobleman's son (22 Henry III., 1241). Five gentlemen attached to the Duke of Gloucester were arrested and condemned for treason, and at the place of execution were hanged, cut down and instantly stripped naked, and their bodies marked for quartering and then pardoned. (22 Henry VI., 1447;

Stow.) Nicholas Bayard, of New York, was tried for high treason and found guilty in 1702. He was sentenced to be "hanged, drawn and quartered." The sentence, however, was not carried into execution. Among unjustifiable hangings may be mentioned that of Robert Emmet, the Irish patriot, September 20, 1803; Nathan Hale, the American patriot, in 1776, and Mrs. Surrat, in 1865.

In England we find that between 1577 and 1603, during the reign of Elizabeth, the "Virgin Queen," one hundred and twenty-four priests and sixty-three laymen and women were "hanged, quartered and disemboweled" because of their Catholic faith. Some of these unfortunates were cut down from the gibbet while still alive and in that condition "dismembered, boweled and quartered." Mrs. Ann Line, an invalid, was executed on February 27, 1601, for "harboring a priest." When asked at the scaffold if she was guilty of the charge against her, she replied that her only regret was that she had harbored only one priest instead of a hundred. Rev. Robert Southwell, S. J., was hanged during the reign of Elizabeth, February 12, 1575, "on account of his priesthood." The Blessed John Travers, O. S. A., was executed in London in 1539. Archbishop Plunket, of Dublin, gave up his life in London on June 8, 1681. The names of the priests and other Catholics of both sexes who were executed in London during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. may be found in "Memoirs of Missionary Priests and Other Catholics of Both Sexes That Have Suffered in England on Religious Account from 1577 to 1684," by Bishop Challoner, Vic. Ap. of London, published in 1840 by Michael Kelly, 341 Market street, Philadelphia, with the approbation of the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, D. D., This book is probably out of print, but I have a copy of it in my library.

Crucifixion was a mode of execution common among Syrians, Egyptians, Persians, Carthaginians, Greeks and Romans. It was esteemed the most dreadful because of the shame attached to it, and it was usually accompanied by other tortures. Ariarathes, of Cappadocia, aged eighty, when vanquished by Perdiceus, was discovered among the prisoners, and by the conqueror's orders was flayed alive and nailed to a cross, together with his principal officers, B. C. 322.

The origin of this special punishment has been attributed to Semiramis, but the refinements of cruelty which were subsequently introduced were growths for which, fortunately, no one name can be held responsible. The details of the Crucifixion of Our Blessed Redeemer, of St. Peter and St. Andrew are too well known to all

Christians to call for any description here, and besides they are of too sacred a character to be treated in conjunction with other executions of the same kind. The usual process of crucifixion was for the victim to carry his own cross to the place of execution, commonly remote; the various tokens of the peculiar shame of the punishment were connected with the procession. Arrived at the fatal spot, the victim was stripped naked. He was fastened to the cross, then lying on the ground, either by spikes driven through the hands and feet, or, in another form of the punishment, by cords bound around them. There was another form of the punishment in which a tree or post was used, the hands being secured by one nail above the victim's head, while the feet were fastened by another nail below. The cross was then erected, the foot or base secured in the ground, and the sufferer left to await death by the slow advance of physical anguish. If the intensity of suffering was too slow in its effect for either the malice or the mercy of those in charge, the victim's legs were broken with heavy blows of a club, his vitals were pierced by thrusts of a spear, a fire was kindled around the foot of the cross or wild beasts were admitted to gnaw his limbs. Some drugged drink was sometimes given. In one form the agony was aggravated by placing the criminal with his head downward, as was the practice in Persia in the case of robbers. Great as was the suffering, such is the power of the human frame to bear it that there are accounts of cases in which life was prolonged for several days. It should be added that to prevent any interference it was customary to keep guards stationed until death was assured. Crucifixion was abolished by Constantine in 330. It continues to be practiced by the Mohammedans.

There was a peculiar punishment, and perhaps a capital one, called "Crucifrangium" by the ancients, inflicted on Roman slaves and Christian martyrs, also on women, old and young. Under Diocletian twenty-three Christians suffered martyrdom in this manner. The legs of the victim were laid on an anvil and by main force fractured by a heavy hammer, somewhat similar to the later custom of breaking the bones of the unfortunate on a wheel by an iron bar.

Execution by the garrote seems to have been originally devised by the Moors and Arabs, and to have been adopted from them by the Spaniards, by whom it has been transmitted to the Spanish colonies in America. In the earliest form it consisted in simply placing a cord around the neck of the criminal, who was seated on a chair fixed to a post, and then twisting the cord by means of a stick inserted between it and the back of the neck till strangulation

was produced. Later on a brass collar was used. It had a screw, which the executioner turned till its point entered the spinal marrow where it unites with the brain, causing instant death. In Cuba it was at one time the usual mode of executing the "insurgents." General Narcisi Lopez, one of the early would-be-liberators of Cuba, was executed by the garrote in the summer of 1851. I remember seeing an execution of this character in my early boyhood and have never forgotten the impression it made upon me.

Speaking of military punishments in times gone by there was one form practiced during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, in France and Germany, known as "Passer par les armes." The accused was tried by a jury of his peers, and if the verdict was not agreeable to the people, the case was submitted to another jury, and even to a third, until a satisfactory decision was reached. If adverse to the prisoner, he was executed there and then. A circle of spearsmen was formed around him, and, amid the beating of drums, the circle narrowed around the victim until his body was transfixed with lances. Death was not slow, for the friends of the accused made sure to shorten his sufferings by piercing the vital parts as quickly as possible.

Peine Forte et Dure, or the terrible punishment of pressing to death, was inflicted upon "mutes," or those who refused to plead "guilty" or "not guilty" when arraigned for treason or felony or who made answers foreign to the purpose. By 12 George III., 1772, a judgment was awarded against mutes as if they were convicted or had confessed. A man refusing to plead was condemned and executed at the Old Bailey, on a charge of murder, 1778, and another, on a charge of burglary, at Wells, 1792. An act was passed in 1827 by which the court was directed to enter a plea of "not guilty" when the prisoner will not plead. Walter Calverly, of Calverly, in Yorkshire, England, having murdered two of his children and stabbed his wife in a fit of jealousy, being arraigned for the crime at the York assizes, stood mute, and was thereupon pressed to death in the castle, a large iron weight being placed upon his breast, August 5, 1605. Major Strangeuay suffered death in a similar manner at Newgate, in 1657, for the murder of his brother-in-law. Margaret Clitheroe, charged with harboring a priest, died under the horrible "*peine forte et dure*." The only case we have any record of in this country was that of Corey, pressed in Massachusetts during the witchcraft delusion.

Shooting was the approved and prevalent form of military punishment, as it was regarded as the "soldier's death." Among the most notable victims may be mentioned Marshal Ney, the "bravest of

the brave" among Napoleon's marshals, shot in 1815; the unfortunate Emperor Maximilian, shot at Queretaro, with Generals Mejia and Miramon, on June 19, 1867, and Edith Cavell, during the late war with Germany. During the ten years of the Cuban struggle for independence many a promising youth was stood up against the grim walls of the Castillo de la Punta, in Havana, and made to face the firing squad for the crime of being patriots. I have seen Spanish soldiers, in the time of Captain General Leopoldo O'Donnell, later on Duke of Tetuan, shot on this spot at early morning for violation of the moral law.

Drowning as a punishment is very ancient. The Britons inflicted death by drowning in a quagmire, as Stow tells us, before B. C. 450. It is said to have been inflicted on eighty Bishops near Nicomedia, A. D. 370, and to have been adopted as a punishment in France by Louis XI. The wholesale drownings of the Royalists in the Loire, near Nantes, by order of Canier, November, 1793, were termed "Noyades." He suffered death himself in 1794. This form of punishment seems to have been in vogue in former times in Syria, Greece, Rome and Persia. Among the various methods was that of attaching some heavy weight to the body, then casting it into the sea or river. Another method was that of sewing the living victim in a sack or bag before casting it into the sea. It is said that George, Duke of Clarence, and brother of Edward IV., for "bold and disorderly words" of expostulation against the injustice done by the King was committed close prisoner to the Tower, and then secretly put to death by immersing his head in a butt of Malmsey wine.

Devouring by wild beasts was another oldtime punishment. Almost every one has been made familiar with the story of the Prophet Daniel and the primitive practice of exposing criminals to be devoured by wild beasts. They were not always literally "cast into the den," however. In some cases the victim was shut into the cage where wild beasts were kept confined; or in some forms of that penalty, man and beast were ushered into the arena or the pit of the circus and allowed to contend as a public show or amusement. The reign of Nero offers numerous instances in which Christians were devoured in the arena of the Coliseum. By the ancient mode of executing parricides so heinous an offender was sewn in a sack alive, venomous serpents with him, and sometimes a dog, a monkey or the like was added. Vipers are mentioned in some accounts of similar executions.

The modes of punishment in different countries and at different times are so numerous and varied that it would take a volume to

describe them in detail. The mere mention of some of them will suffice for the purpose of this paper.

In Cochín-China, before the occupation by the French, a woman convicted of adultery was trampled to death by an elephant trained for the purpose, and in Tonquin female criminals were tied to a loose stake, and in that situation delivered to the elephant, who seized them with his trunk, threw them into the air, then caught them on his tusks and ended by trampling them under his feet. Stripping the skin from the body of the condemned while he yet lived was formerly practiced in England and among the ancient Mexicans in their sacrificial rites. In England it came to be regarded as a barbarous mode of torturing an offender to death rather than a punishment in a judicial sense.

The mode of punishment which includes "flogging" and the "knout," recently abolished in Russia, are covered by the terms "scourging," "whipping," has not been used, primarily at least, in the other European countries, in modern times for capital punishment, that is, has not been used when the sentence or judicial design has been to inflict death. In Russia the condemned man is led half-naked to the place chosen for this mode of torture; all that he has on is a pair of simple cotton drawers around his extremities; his hands are bound together, palm to palm. He is told to lie down upon his stomach, on a frame inclined diagonally, and at the extremity of which are fixed iron rings. His hands are fastened to one end of the frame and his feet to the other. He is then stretched in such a manner that he cannot make the slightest movement, just as an eel's skin is stretched out to dry. This stretching of the victim causes his bones to crack and dislocates them. The executioner advances a few steps, holding the knout in both hands. When within the proper distance from the prisoner he raises it by a vigorous movement and brings it down on the body of the poor victim. In spite of his tension the body bounds as if submitted to a powerful shock of galvanism. When the thong encircles the body, the flesh and muscles are literally cut in strips as with a razor, but when it falls flat then the bones crack. The flesh in this latter case is not cut, but crushed and bruised, and the blood spurts out in all directions. The sufferer becomes green and blue, like a cadaver in a state of decomposition. The knout is fatal if the whim of the Czar or of the executioner desires it to be so.

Akin to this mode of punishment is the bastinado or bastinado. It consists, according to the strict sense of the term, in the infliction of blows on the soles of the feet with a thick stick. Turkey and Russia are the only European countries in which this mode

of punishment has been sanctioned by law and in both countries it has been carried on to a most unjustifiable extent, the sufferer being frequently maimed and injured for a long time, if not for life. During the '70's the number of Greek Catholic Uniates who suffered untold tortures in this way because they refused to become "orthodox" ran into the thousands. The bastinado has been and may still be a common kind of punishment in China, as well as in Persia and all Eastern countries where Mohammedanism prevails, being ordered by the Koran for many minor offenses.

We can scarcely dismiss the subject of punishments without referring to the various forms visited upon vixens and scolding wives. They seem to have been provided for by the laws of England, from the fifteenth to the eighteenth and even into the nineteenth centuries. The cucking-stool did not, like the ducking-stool, admit of immersion, and was used for both men and women. It was a simple chair, in which the crank or offender was placed, before his or her door, to be pelted and insulted by the mob. In the course of time it gave way to the ducking-stool, which was reserved expressly for women. She was seated in a chair, placed over the water, at the end of a beam, with her arms fastened behind her. The instrument worked on the see-saw principle, and the unfortunate scold was ducked as many times as the sentence called for. Sometimes a poor woman, accused of offenses against the moral code, was placed astride of an ass, with her back to his head and compelled to hold his tail in her hands. In this way, preceded by the officers of the law, she was led through the streets and subjected to the hoots and jeers of the entire populace, who never failed to turn out in large numbers on such occasions. In New England the scold does not seem to have met with any more favor than she did in the mother country; for Josselyn, writing of the old "Body Laws of 1646," says: "They gag and set them at their doors for certain hours, for all comers and goers-by to gaze at." . . . "Ducking in running water" was also a punishment for this class of offenders.

The "pillory," "stocks" and "whipping post" have been seen in this country as well as in Europe. I remember seeing Spanish soldiers in Cuba sitting in the "stocks" for violating some law of military discipline. Cooper, in his "Leather Stocking," describes his hero as "doing time" in the "stocks," while the "whipping post" has been a method of punishment long in vogue in the State of Delaware.

The "ordeal" was a form of trial practiced in the Middle Ages under the belief of an actual interposition of heaven to free the innocent and condemn the guilty. Hence it received the name of

"*Judicium Dei*." A decree of the Fourth Council of Lateran (1215) was issued declaring against trial by ordeal as being the work of the devil. Some authorities claim that the earliest trace of this practice is to be found in the "law of jealousy," or the "waters of jealousy," mentioned in Numbers v., 29. The fact remains that the ordeal had existed for many ages before it was introduced into Europe. In principle and often in the very form used it belongs to ancient culture, thence flourishing up to the mediæval European and modern Asiatic levels, but dying out before the light of modern civilization and its condemnation by the Church.

Some ordeals are simply magical, being processes of divination turned to legal purposes. In Burmah, for example, suits are still, or were until quite recently, determined by the plaintiff and defendant being each furnished with a candle of equal size and both lighted at once. He whose candle outlasts the other is judged, amid the applause of his friends, to have won the cause.

The subject of "ordeals" is too extensive to be described here in all its forms; we shall, therefore, content ourselves with giving a few examples. A classical mention of the ordeals by carrying hot irons in the hands and by passing through the fire is made more interesting by the contestants, who offer to prove their innocence in this way; offering further to take oaths by the gods, which shows the intimate connection between oaths and ordeals. (See Soph., *ant.* 264. See also Æschyl. p. 284.) The passing through fire is described in the Hindoo Codes of Yagnavalkyn, and others, and in an incident of Hindoo poetry, where, in the Ramayana, the virtuous Sita thus proves her innocence to her jealous husband Rama. (Pietet, "*Origines Indo-Européennes*.") It was not less known to European law and chronicle. We read that Recaidia, wife of Charles the Fat, proved her innocence by going into the fire clad in a waxen garment and came out unhurt by the fire. (Grimm, "*Deutsche Ruchstsalterheimer*.") Yet more minutely described in the Hindoo ordeal books is the rite of carrying the glowing hot iron seven steps, into the seven or nine circles traced on the ground, the examination of the hands to see if they show traces of burning, and the binding them up in leaves. The close historical connection of the Hindoo ordeal laws with the old European is shown by the correspondence of minute details; as where, in a Scandinavian law, it is prescribed that the red hot iron shall be carried nine steps. (See Grimm.) In the "*Anglo-Saxon Laws and Institutes of England*," iv., 6, we learn that the iron to be carried was, at first, only one pound in weight, but Athelston's laws increased it to three pounds.

Another form of the ordeal well known in Germany and Eng-

land was the walking barefoot over glowing plowshares, generally nine. In the works above referred to, we further learn that the law code of the Middle Ages shows this as an ordinary criminal procedure, but it is perhaps best remembered in two stories, both without foundation, one regarding Kunegunda, the wife of the Emperor Henry II., of Germany, and the other relating to Queen Emma, mother of St. Edward the Confessor, both of whom the legend tells us triumphantly vindicated their good name by walking unharmed over nine glowing plowshares. The actual practice of the fire ordeal contrasts shamefully with the theory that the fire rather than harm the innocent restrained its natural action. Thus it stands in the Hindoo Code of Mana (viii., 115): "He whom the flame does not burn, whom the water does not cast up, or whom no harm soon befalls, is to be taken as truthful to his oath." In Spain, the test by fire was formally condemned by a synod held at Valladolid, in 1322. In code xxvii., it declares: "The tests of fire and water are forbidden; whoever participates in them is 'ipso facto' excommunicated."

In 1361 the ordeal seems to have assumed a peculiar phase, for we have an account of an extraordinary duel which took place in Paris in that year between a man and a dog. It was of the nature of a judicial combat, in which the right or wrong of a charge was supposed to be proved by the result of a fight for life. A French gentleman, M. Abryde Montdidier, had been murdered and his body buried in a wood. His dog remained by the grave until forced by hunger to leave it. The peculiar actions of the animal induced some persons to follow it, and the body of the murdered man was discovered. Some time afterward the dog flew at the throat of a certain Chevalier Macaire. Suspicion being aroused and the fact coming to the knowledge of the King, the dog was brought into court, and there from a crowd of courtiers the animal picked out Macaire and flew savagely at him. As Macaire denied the crime the King ordered that it should be left to the *judicium Dei*, in a duel with the dog. The lists were prepared and Macaire was provided with a large stick and the dog with an empty cask in which he could find refuge from assault. But far from seeking shelter the dog attacked Macaire so fiercely as to seize him by the throat and bring him to the ground, whereupon he confessed his crime and implored pardon.

Ordeals appear to have been practiced among the ancient Greeks, as we learn from the "Antigone" of Sophocles that a person suspected by Creon of misdemeanor declared himself ready to "handle hot iron and to walk on fire," and Grotius gives many instances of war ordeals in Bithynia and Sardinia and other places. Germany

seems to have been the principal field for the development of ordeals, and this not only in Germany itself, but in the provinces that became subject to it.

Perhaps it might be well to recall the fact that trial by combat was resorted to in feudal times in all doubtful cases, and especially when a crime not capable of notorious proof was charged. It does not seem to have established itself in France till ordeals went into disuse. It may be met with under the Merovingian kings, and seems to have prevailed in Burgundy. It was established by the laws of the Alemanni and Suabians (Baluz, c. i., p. 80). It was always popular in Lombardy. Otho II. established it in all disputes concerning real estate, and there is a famous case where the right of representation, or preference of the son of a deceased elder child to his uncle, in succession to his grandfather's estate, was settled by this test. It was introduced into England for accusations of treason, if neither the accuser nor the accused would produce good evidence. The first battle by single combat was fought before the king and peers between Geoffrey Bayard and William, Earl of Eu, who was accused by the former of high treason. Bayard, having conquered his antagonist, was deemed innocent. The last combat proposed was between Lord Reay and David Ramsay, in 1631, but the king interposed and prevented it. The same method of trial also existed in Ireland. A trial was appointed between the Prior of Kilmainham and the Earl of Ormond, the former having impeached the latter of high treason, but the quarrel, having been taken up by the king, was decided without fighting, in 1446. A remarkable combat took place in Dublin Castle, before the Lords Justices and council, between Connor McCormack O'Connor and Teig McGilpatrick O'Connor, in which the former had his head cut off and presented to the Lords Justices, 1553.

The Wager Fight was most common in Germany. When a man was accused of a crime, he had the right to demand personal combat to prove his innocence. When a woman happened to be the accuser, she was subject to challenge by the man she accused; but as he was by his superior strength certain to overcome his weaker antagonist, he was required to stand in a hole or pit, up to his waist. The arms were clubs, or the woman might use a cloth in which a stone weighing from one to five pounds was tied. This fight was a very serious matter, for the conquered party forfeited life, and, in the case of a woman, she was buried alive in the pit where her antagonist had stood.

There are many other forms of trial by ordeal, such as the

"Wine and Cheese" ordeal, in which the accused was required to consume a certain quantity of these aliments; if they produced no unpleasant results, the accused was pronounced guiltless. Another form, dating back to the eighth century, was the Cross ordeal in which both the accuser and the accused were required to stand before a cross with arms extended; he whose arms fell first was declared to be the culprit. The list of old-time punishments and ordeals is by no means exhausted, for the laws were as capricious as the criminals were ingenious.

To-day, if our laws are less capricious, they are, to say the least, less troublesome to the malefactor, and seem loth to leave the pages of our statute books, else we would not hear of seditious meetings in our public halls and sentiments not above suspicion proclaimed even within the walls of our National Capitol. Father Rickaby, the learned Jesuit, in his "Moral Philosophy," defines punishment as "medicinal, deterrent and retributive." "As it is medicinal," he goes on to say, "it serves the offender; as it is deterrent, it serves the Commonwealth; as it is retributive, it serves the offended party, being a reparation offered to him."

I sometimes wonder what medicine can reach the case of those who violate treaties; who visit with fire and sword the homes of noncombatants; who murder and ill use defenseless women and maim their children; who deport and scatter whole populations and starve them in their exile; who sink ships freighted with women and children; who shoot down in cold blood the minister of God and the nurse who is tending to their wounded; who bomb unprotected cities and grand cathedrals out of pure wantonness; who poison wells and destroy fruit trees and the very machinery that gives employment to thousands of laborers; who incite riots and who plot in every country in the world, etc., etc. What "deterrent" will reach these miscreants that civilization and humanity could devise for any other people and be regarded effective under present circumstances, and finally, what "retribution" can be asked that "will fit the crime?"

"The land wants such
As dare with rigor execute the laws.

* * * * *

He's a bad surgeon that for pity spares
The part corrupted till the gangrene spreads
And all the body perish; he that's merciful
Unto the bad, is cruel to the good."

MARC F. VALLETTE.

WHAT ARE THE EXACT REQUISITES FOR AN EX CATHEDRA UTTERANCE OF THE HOLY FATHER?¹

THE declaration of the Vatican Council runs as follows:
"We teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma that when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the exercise of his functions as the Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, he, in accordance with his supreme Apostolic authority, defines doctrine touching faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, the Roman Pontiff enjoys by the divine assistance promised to him in the person of Blessed Peter that same infallibility wherewith the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be furnished in defining doctrine touching faith or morals. Wherefore the definitions of the said Roman Pontiff are of themselves—not by reason of the consent of the Church—irreformable."

The Council here lays down that the prerogative of infallibility is exercised when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra*. Infallibility is thus attached to an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. What is the precise relationship between these two terms? It is clear that the Pope is not infallible *because* he speaks *ex cathedra*; he is infallible *because* the Church is indefectible. But when the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* he, so to speak, assumes the toga of infallibility; in other words, the speaking *ex cathedra* is the occasion for the exercise of infallibility, not its cause. After declaring, then, the circumstances under which the infallibility is exercised, the Council immediately states what is meant by an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. Certain conditions are laid down for such a pronouncement. The Pope is said to speak *ex cathedra* when (a) he speaks as *Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians*; (b) in the exercise of his *Supreme Apostolic authority*; (c) when *defining* a doctrine; (d) which doctrine must be concerned with *faith or morals*; (e) and must be one which is to be held by the *Universal Church*.

Two further statements are made, viz., (a) that this infallibility is due to the "assistance" of the Holy Spirit; (b) that the personal infallibility of the Pope is the same as that of the Church. It might seem, then, that the answer to the question before us was an exceedingly simple affair, since it should be sufficient to indicate the above conditions for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement. But unfortunately it is one thing to say what an *ex cathedra* pronouncement is and what are its constituent features, quite another to say how we are to recognize the presence of those features. The question, then, before us is: How are we to know when the conditions for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement are present?

¹A paper read before the Anglican Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury, May 22, 1917.

It might be urged that the style of the document should betray its character; that *ex cathedra* pronouncements are framed in a certain way, contain certain set phrases, etc., which serve to distinguish them from other less formal Papal declarations. But this would only remove the difficulty a step further back, for men would at once begin to ask for a decree, saying that the Pope is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra*, and that he speaks *ex cathedra* when he uses a certain formula, and that this formula is to be understood in this sense and not in that, and so on *ad infinitum*. Moreover, the Pope as supreme legislator cannot be bound by any formula unless he himself chooses; and what one Pope might elect as his personal formula, another might lay aside.

Further, if appeal is made to the statement of the Council that an *ex cathedra* decision is easily recognizable because it presents the features above enumerated, it can with justice be objected (a) that it is not always easy to decide when the Pope speaks as "Universal Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians." How are we to know whether he is speaking as a private doctor or as the universal doctor? And is there no *via media* between these two? (b) Who is to tell whether he is really exercising his *Supreme* Apostolic authority? He may be speaking from a lower level than this. (c) Again, when have we a "definition"? The term is often used loosely. In fact, the Bishops in Council write: "Ego, N., definiens subscripsi." (d) Further, the term "faith and morals" is vague in its extent; things may be directly or indirectly connected with faith and morals; this connection may be proximate or exceedingly remote. Who is to assign limits to the comprehension of all sorts of details within the scope of "faith and morals"? (e) If the Pope writes to an individual whose views are held to be reprehensible, *e. g.*, de Lamennais, can it be said that mere publication of the letter enables us to class it amongst those addressed to the Universal Church? (f) And lastly, this doctrine so defined is one which is to be "held" by the Universal Church; it does not say that it "is to be held *as of faith*." What, then, is the precise force of this expression? These difficulties, which have been all of them raised at one time or another, will show that there remains considerable room for discussion when the question is put: How are we to recognize the presence of the constituents necessary for an *ex cathedra* pronouncement?

I.

Let us first of all examine the decree of the Council. Session IV., with which alone we are concerned, contains four chapters with a preamble. The latter points out the necessity of declaring the mind

of the Church touching the institution, the perpetuity and the precise nature of the Primacy; these three points are defined respectively in chapters i.-iii. Chapter iv., with which we are immediately concerned, points out (a) that the plenitude of the teaching office is inseparably connected with sound doctrine touching the Primacy; the Councils of Constantinople, Lyons and Florence are quoted to this effect, and it is further pointed out that the Church has always held the doctrine of the Primacy; (b) the reasons for this plenitude of teaching authority are then set forth in words which may be given in full:

"The gift, then (*charisma*), of a truth and a faith which shall never fail was divinely bestowed upon Peter and his successors in this See (*Cathedra*), so that they might exercise this their lofty function for the salvation of all men, so that the entire flock of Christ should by their means be preserved from the poisonous food of error and nourished with the food of heavenly doctrine, and that all occasion of schism being thus removed—the whole Church might be preserved in unity and established upon its own foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell."

Then, after stating that the prevalent contempt of this doctrine compels the Church to assert it with vigor, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility is thus defined:

"We, therefore, adhering to the traditions faithfully handed down from the beginnings of Christianity, for the glory of God our Saviour, for the exaltation of the Catholic religion and for the salvation of the Christian peoples, with the approbation of this Sacred Council, teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the exercise of his office as the Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, he, in accordance with his supreme Apostolic authority, defines a doctrine touching faith or morals which is to be held by the Universal Church—the Roman Pontiff enjoys by the divine assistance promised to him in the person of the Blessed Peter, that infallibility wherewith the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be furnished in defining doctrine touching faith or morals: and that in consequence the definitions of the said Roman Pontiff are of themselves—not from the Church's consent—irreformable.

"If any, one should presume to contradict this our definition—which God forbid—let him be anathema."

It may be as well to state here what is meant by "infallibility." Briefly: in the first place, infallibility is not *revelation*, as the Council explicitly declares: "The Holy Spirit was not promised to Peter's successors with a view to their declaring new doctrine through revelation from Him, but in order that they might by His assistance

preserve inviolate and might faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith handed down by the Apostles." Neither is infallibility to be confused with *inspiration*, as is again declared in the preliminary Acts of the Council.² Neither is it a *habit*, for a habit denotes some quality not only permanently possessed, but usable at will; whereas infallibility is a qualification of the successor of St. Peter which only comes into play under certain definite circumstances. So far negatively. Positively infallibility is inability to err under certain circumstances, and this inability to err does not depend upon any sudden flood of light whether conscious or unconscious—for thus it would be identical with inspiration—but upon the perpetual corrective and suggestive action of the Holy Spirit standing by or "assisting."

Indeed, we have to be particularly careful lest through a conventional use of terms we fall into error when speaking of infallibility. For we sometimes hear people say that the sun will infallibly rise to-morrow. But this would be more correctly formulated by saying: God knows infallibly that the sun will rise or not. For infallibility is a subjective *charisma* qualifying knowledge, but not affecting the thing known save as conferring certitude regarding it. Hence it follows that many propositions may be absolutely true and yet not infallibly so, since no one may know them, least of all know them infallibly. Or again, they may be set forth as certainly true yet not set forth under the influence of the *charisma* of infallibility.

II.

The question at issue, then, is—to repeat—by what criteria are we to ascertain the presence or absence of the various qualifications for an *ex cathedra* or infallible pronouncement? Let us take each qualification in turn and submit it to analysis.

The first qualification laid down is that the Pope must be exercising "his functions as the Shepherd and *Teacher* of all Christians." It is, of course, impossible to conceive a Church which has no teaching office. The Christian Church, then, being founded by Christ and being truly "the kingdom of God upon earth," must have received from Him the power, the duty and the right to teach. When we say that the Church teaches infallibly, we mean that the formal teaching of the Church is free from error. When we say that the Supreme Pontiff is infallible we do not mean that he is *also* infallible as though the Church and the Pope were two distinct subjects in which this quality of infallibility is resident, but precisely as a man's acts, while emanating from his head or his brain, are yet acts of the whole man, so that while the head or brain is the principle

² "Collectio Lacensis," vii., pp. 76-77.

whence ultimately the acts flow, the whole man is the subject in which those acts reside, so, too, in the case of the Pope and the Church: he is the head whence emanate certain qualities which are also correctly spoken of as resident in the body which is the Church.

To avoid confusion we will begin by examining certain preliminary points, *viz.*, (a) the Teaching Office and the consequent meaning of the term *ex cathedra*; (b) the precise meaning of faith, whether Divine, Divine-Catholic or Ecclesiastical; (c) and lastly the term "infallibility" itself.

Thus note the declaration made at the Council: "The proper subject of infallibility, to wit: that to which it primarily and essentially belongs, is, as we are taught by the Scriptures, the actual Apostolic teaching office, which is divinely and for all time established in the Church through whose infallible teaching the infallibility of the faith flows out to the Universal Church."³ And as a commentary on these words, note the opening clause of the definition regarding the veneration due to sacred images which was published by the second Council of Nice, A. D. 787: "Keeping, then, to the royal road and following the divinely inspired teaching of our Holy Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church—for we know that this is from the Holy Spirit who dwells in her—we define with all exactness and diligence."⁴

The basis of the Church's infallibility, then, is her teaching office, and this latter rests on such passages as *going therefore, teach all nations * * * teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world.*⁵ The Church is therefore essentially a teaching society. Analysis of the concept "society" shows us that it is only comparable to personality: St. Paul has worked out this analogy for us in detail.⁶ But personality involves monarchy, a final court of appeal, a supreme directing influence coördinating all the various principles which go to make up the whole. In other words, personality, and therefore "society," necessarily involves authority. This concept underlies the *Pastoral Epistles*; it is expressed in that "sound teaching" which forms the undercurrent, so to speak, of those first episcopal "charges."⁷ It could not be expressed in more concise form than in the Apostle's dictum: "the Church of the Living God,

³ "Collectio Lacensis," vii., p. 598.

⁴ Cf. Denzinger, "Enchiridion," eleventh ed., No. 302.

⁵ Mt. xxviii., 19-20; Mk. xvi., 15-16; Jn. xx., 21-23, and *cp.* the office of "witness" so emphatically assigned to the Apostles, e. g., Lk. xxiv., 48, and claimed by them with equal emphasis. Acts i., 22, ii., 32, x., 39, etc.

⁶ I. Cor. xii., *cp.* Rom. xii., Ephes. iv.

⁷ The words *didakalia*, *didasko* and *didache* are paramount in these Epistles.

the pillar and ground of the truth."⁸ The same feature lies at the root of that "monarchical" episcopate which also appears so vividly in the same *Pastoral Epistles* and finds its fullest expression in the *Epistles of St. Ignatius*.⁹ This "monarchical" episcopate, necessitated by the responsibility of the supreme teaching office, is the real key to St. Irenaeus' teaching in his "Adversus Haereses";¹⁰ it appears—where perhaps we should least expect to find it—in Origen;¹¹ it was the dominant note of St. Cyprian's controversy,¹² though this again will come as a shock to many; finally St. Augustine and St. Jerome repeatedly bear witness to it.¹³ In scholastic

⁸ I. Tim. iii., 15.

⁹ E. g., "So that in one and the same obedience ye all may be perfect, so that through subordination to the Bishop and the presbytery ye may be in all things sanctified (Ephes. ii.) This teaching is the ever-repeated burden of Ignatius' Epistles, cp. Ephes. v., xx., Magnes. ii., vi., vii., xiii., Trall. ii., iii., vii., xiii., Smyrn. viii., Phil. iii., iv., vii., Polyc. vi., cf. Clement, I. Corinth xlii.-xliv. It is surely no mere accident that to the Romans alone St. Ignatius does not address such exhortations, but rather: "Never have ye envied others; others ye have taught. * * * Not as did Peter and Paul do I command you." (Rom. iii., 4.)

¹⁰ E. g., "Adv. Haer.," c. III., 1, iii.; xxvi., 5.

¹¹ E. g., "Praef.," 2 in "De Principiis."

¹² As for St. Cyprian, it should suffice to read Epp. xxvi., xxxix., xlv., liv., where note in section 14, "the throne of Peter, the chief church whence priestly unity takes its source," lxviii., 8, "the Church which is Catholic and one is not cut nor divided, but is indeed connected and bound together by the cement of priests, who cohere with one another," cp. lxix., 3; lxxii., 7-11; "De Habitu Virginum" 10, "De unitate Ecclesiae," v., 3. He would be a bold man who would nowadays deny the authenticity of the disputed passages in the "De Unitate." See Dom John Chapman's Papers in "J. T. S.," Oct., 1902, also against the so-called interpolations, St. Cyprian's "Treatises" in the Oxford translation, Vol. III., pp. 150-152, and Prof. Hugo Koch, "Cyprian und der Römische Primat," Leipsic, 1910, with Dom Chapman's answer in the "Rev. Benedictine."

¹³ E. g., "Contra Cresconium," III., lxiv., (71), P. L., XLIII., 535: "O the mad folly of men! You think you deserve praise because ye believe in the Christ, whom ye see not, and you think ye do not deserve condemnation for your repudiation of the Church, which ye see; whereas the former is the Head in heaven, the latter His Body on earth!" And note St. Augustine's remarkable words: "Our Heavenly Teacher even went so far as to give us a warning hint with a view to rendering His people secure against evil superiors, lest on their account the chair (cathedra) of health-giving doctrine should be spurned; in it even the wicked are compelled to say what is good. Indeed, what they say is not their own, but God's, for in the Chair (cathedra) of unity He placed the doctrine of truth." Ep. CV., v., (16), P. L., XXXIII., 403. Again, on the vexed question of the origin of the soul he quotes a passage from Pope Zozimus, and then says: "In these words of the Apostolic See, so ancient and so established, so sure and so clear is the Catholic faith that it is impious for a Christian to doubt it." (Ep. CXC., vi., (23); P. L., XXXIII., 866.) St. Jerome is still more explicit; of Vigilantius he says: "He is condemned by the authority of the Roman Church." "Contra Vigilantium," 1, P. L. XXIII., 340. To Rufinus: "In none of these things, he says, is there aught in which he differs from our faith. Let the Latin reader judge for

days it was the pivot, so to speak, of the dogmatic teaching of such men as Blessed Albert the Great and St. Thomas. Indeed it could not be more emphatically stated than in a too little known passage of St. Thomas, who in his "Summa contra Gentiles," after treating of the Sacrament of Order, proceeds to speak of the episcopal dignity which is necessitated by the sacrament of Order. He begins by pointing out that "so far as the consecration of Christ's Body is concerned, the episcopal does not exceed the priestly power, but that it does exceed it in the relation it has to the faithful (*viz.*, in jurisdiction)." This leads him to the next point, *viz.*, that "just as in any particular congregation of the one Church it is necessary to have one Bishop who is to be the head of the whole congregation, so in the entire Christian world we must have one who shall be the head of the entire Church. Further, for the unity of the Church all the faithful must agree in the faith. Since, then, questions are wont to arise touching the faith and the Church would be divided by divergences of opinion, the Church can only be preserved in unity by one man's decision. For the sake of this unity, then, it is necessary that there should be one who presides over the whole Church." St. Thomas then insists that since the Church's mode of government must of necessity be the best, since it was established by Him through whom *kings reign and lawgivers decree just things*,¹⁴ and since peace—which is the true object of all government—can only be satisfactorily secured through monarchical government, "it will be manifest that the government of the Church must be such that one governs the entire Church." He then meets the objection that Christ is the one Head and that we need no other. Not so, he says, for the whole idea of the Christian ministry is that Christ instituted it to make up for the withdrawal of His bodily presence in our midst, and that for the same reason "it was fitting that He should appoint some one person who should have charge of the whole Church *in His place*," and he quotes the familiar Petrine texts in support of this.¹⁵ Lastly the saint dwells on the necessity of perpetuity in this ministry: the Church was to endure to the end of time,¹⁶ and therefore, too, its ministry must so continue, in accordance with the promise, *I am with you all days even*

himself. What is this faith which he calls his? Is it the same as that which gives strength to the Roman Church? Or is it that which he finds in Origen's volumes? If he replies that it is the Roman faith, then we are both of us Catholics!" "Adv. Rufinum" I., 4; P. L. XXIII., 400; cp. "Contra Vigilantium," 6; on Daniel ix.; P. L. XXV., 542, and for "the mind of the Catholic Church" on Gal. iv., 1.

¹⁴ Prov. viii., 15.

¹⁵ Jn. xxi., 17ff., Lk. xxii., 32, Mt. xvi., 19.

¹⁶ Is. ix., 7.

to the end of time. His closing words are worth noting: "Hereby is excluded the presumptuous error of those men who endeavor to withdraw themselves from obedience and submission to Peter by refusing to recognize his successor, the Roman Pontiff, as the shepherd of the Universal Church."¹⁷

The point to be noted is that while the episcopacy is necessary for conferring orders and for jurisdiction in general, this jurisdiction itself is particularly necessitated by the obligation of preserving unity in the faith, and that is only secured by submission to one who stands in the place of Christ Himself and who can speak with plenary authority. It is this plenary authority which is comprised in the term *ex cathedra*, a term derived, of course, from Christ's reference to the *Cathedra* of Moses.¹⁸

III.

The second qualification of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement is that the Pope should speak "in accordance with his supreme Apostolic authority." This implies at once that there are occasions when the Pope speaks with less than his supreme Apostolic authority. When does this take place and how are we to arrive at the knowledge that he is speaking from the fulness or from less than the fulness of that authority?

It must be borne in mind that the Supreme Pontiff has a three-

¹⁷ "Summa contra Gentiles," Lib. IV., cap. lxxvi. We have felt compelled to draw attention to this passage not merely because of its cogency, but in refutation of an accusation which has been made more than once, and again in recent days by Mr. Athelstan Riley, who wrote to the "Church Times," Jan. 14, 1916, to explain why he was not a Romanist. "Because," he says, "I could not pass through one hedge, the acceptance of the Papal claims. That hedge would tear from me all self-respect; I believe these claims to be historically false. That spurious documents largely assisted in building up the Roman theory will hardly be denied by any. No Roman theologian now believes, for instance, in the forged Decretals. (One may ask whether any theologian ever did so!) But St. Thomas and all the great theologians who built up the Roman system had no suspicion of their falsity * * * St. Thomas in his 'Opusculum contra Errores Graecorum' relied upon a catena of Greek fathers forged by a Latin theologian about 1261, and provided by Pope Urban IV., let us hope innocently, for the purpose of helping him to maintain the Papal claims. I believe there is not a single passage quoted by St. Thomas that is not spurious." We will only point out that the "Opusculum" in question can hardly be called "constructive" theology; it would much more aptly be called "a statement of the case"; St. Thomas' constructive theology is to be looked for in the two "Summas," that known as the "Contra Gentiles" and the "Summa Theologica." The argument for the Papacy will be found in the latter. IIda., IIdae, i., 10; that from the "Contra Gentiles" we have just seen. Needless to say that in neither case is the argument derived from authority.

¹⁸ Mt. xxiii., 2.

fold character:¹⁹ he is presumably an eminent theologian whose opinion must always carry weight; he is also the Pope, *i. e.*, the Head of the Church, and he may in this capacity feel called upon to speak out strongly on certain burning questions. His opinions in this capacity have a special weight in virtue of his dignity, yet who shall say that he is always on such occasions speaking with the plenitude of his authority? His declarations as Head of the Church may be certainly true, but yet not infallibly certain, since this particular *charisma* of infallibility has not been called into play. Consequently, while they demand our most respectful hearing, we clearly cannot give to them the assent of faith, since we cannot be called upon to assent with faith—whether divine-Catholic or ecclesiastical—to an obscure truth unless we have some guarantee that such assent is demanded. It is here that what has been happily termed the *pietas fidei* comes into play, as for instance in the case of an encyclical such as the “*Rerum Novarum* on the Condition of the Laboring Classes.” No one can ask us to believe with divine-Catholic faith what the Pope sets forth in this famous encyclical, and for the simple reason that it is no question of revelation. But neither can we afford to treat such a pronouncement as though it merely emanated from some distinguished theologian; it is much more than that, it is a weighty pronouncement by the Head of Christendom. A notable instance of this is at hand in disciplinary decrees, *e. g.*, in a decree regarding the fast of Lent, whether enforcing it or relaxing it. To refuse adherence to such a decree would argue a failure to recognize what is known as the “*quotidianum magisterium Ecclesiae*,” which permeates the entirety of Catholic life. Moreover, such decrees, while not emanating from the plenitude of power or the fulness of the magisterium, may only just fall short of it, while the resulting declaration may well be closely connected with dogma and may but voice the general mind of the Church. In this connection it will be well to note Pius IXth’s “Letter to the Archbishop of Munich,” December 21, 1863. The Pontiff has found reason to complain of the attitude adopted by certain German professors towards the fathers and doctors of the Church whom they apparently treated as “out of date.” The views of these professors were a foretaste of the Modernism of a later day. Pius IX. therefore points out that “we must keep revelation before our eyes as our guiding star if we would avoid error”—it should be borne in mind that he is dealing with professors of philosophy rather than with theologians—and he continues:

“We are unwilling to believe that these men are desirous to limit the obligation whereby Catholic teachers and writers are strictly

¹⁹ Coll. *Lacensis*, vii., 285, 1290-94, 1323, 1350.

bound, merely to those points which are set forth by the Church's infallible judgment as dogmas of the faith which all have to believe. Neither can we believe that they would wish to hold that that perfect adhesion to revealed truths which they acknowledge to be absolutely necessary if real progress in science is to be made and error to be refuted, can be attained by faithful and obedient acceptance merely of those dogmas which are expressly defined by the Church. For even if it were a question of that submission which is called for when divine faith is in question, yet even that cannot be limited to things defined by express decrees published by Œcumenical Councils or by the occupants of this Roman See, but has to be extended to those things as well which, by the ordinary teaching authority of the Church dispersed throughout the world, are handed down as divinely revealed and which are therefore by universal and constant consent considered by Catholic theologians as belonging to the faith.

"But since it is really question of that submission to which all Catholics who are occupied with speculative science are in conscience bound if their writings would bring fresh gain to the Church, it follows that these professorial bodies must acknowledge that it is not sufficient for learned Catholics to receive and venerate the aforesaid dogmas of the Church, but it is also necessary for them to submit themselves both to decisions touching doctrine which emanate from the Pontifical congregations and to those points of doctrine which by the common and constant consent of Catholics are regarded as theological truths and as conclusions which are so certain that, while opinions opposed to these points of doctrine may not be declared heretical, they yet merit some other theological censure."²⁰

This Letter, be it noted, antedates the declaration of the Vatican Council by seven years. In it the Holy Father distinguishes between the assent which all must give to the infallible decisions of the Church and that *pietas fidei* which displayed in submission to decisions which, while not infallible, are yet binding on the consciences of all who would call themselves true sons of the Church. With regard to the former he expressly declares that divine faith cannot be limited to things defined, but must be extended to declarations emanating from "the ordinary teaching authority of the Church dispersed throughout the world." The importance of this cannot be overrated.

Moreover, the same Letter shows us that there is a very clear line of demarcation between pronouncements which proceed from the fulness of Apostolic authority and those which express the general voice of the Church. The question before us, to repeat, is what

²⁰ Cf. Denzinger, "Enchiridion," 11th ed. Nos. 1679-1684.

precisely are the criteria whereby we can distinguish between these two classes of pronouncements. The former are *ex cathedra*, the latter are not.

IV.

The next qualification requisite for an *ex cathedra* decision is that the point defined concerns faith or morals, *viz.*, the traditional belief and the traditional practice. By "faith" is here meant the objects on which our subjective faith or belief is exercised. But since acts are specified by their objects it will follow that divine faith is only present when a revealed truth is the object of belief.²¹ Faith, then, may be defined as assent to an obscure truth by reason of evidence extrinsic to it, *i. e.*, authority. According as this "authority" is human or divine, faith will be either human or divine, there is no middle term; your authority to which you are said to pin your faith is either God or man. But at the same time, while it is true that, strictly speaking, there is no halfway house between authority either human or divine, yet a human authority may possess qualifications which approximate it to the divine, in other words we have the "priest," who is coeval with the world's history. Now the essential difference between the priesthood of the Old and the New Testaments lies in this: that the priest of the former was constituted as such by God, but only to offer to God man's gifts. It is true that now and again he was the vehicle through whom God communicated His behests to men. We say "now and again," because it was not in virtue of his priestly office that God thus

²¹ The precision of scholastic terminology on this point should be noted; for just as coloured objects alone are the formal object of my visual powers, *e. g.*, no one can see what is colorless; so, too, no keenness of vision will enable me to see in the dark; a third factor in addition to visual power color is required, *viz.*, light, for it alone can bring the faculty of vision into connection with its true object. The same feature occurs in the exercise of faith; the presence of the subjective light—which we call the habit of faith—and the existence of revealed truths are insufficient of themselves to produce an act of faith unless subject and object be brought into connection by authority which says that God has revealed certain definite things. This authority may be either God Himself or His Church. And this authority, again, on which depends the actual exercise of faith, is analogous to the action of light which produces the actual exercise of vision. Scholastic philosophy expresses these facts by terming color the *objectum formale quod* of vision; light it terms the *objectum formale quo* (*mediate scil.*), the actual colored objects seen constitute the *objectum materiale*, while the visual faculty is the subjective principle. In the same way for faith; the light of faith, or the habit, is the subjective principle; the actual truths believed are the material objects; their divine or supernatural character constitutes the *objectum formale quod*; the fact that God has revealed them is the *objectum formale quo*, while the Church is the medium or organ whereby we know that God has actually revealed them.

communicated through him; the prophetic office was distinct from the priestly, the one did not involve the other. The priest of the New Testament on the contrary is appointed by God as the medium through whom God's gifts to men are distributed, whether these gifts are sacramental or whether they consist in teaching communicated through the priest. At the same time we find in the Old Law that the priests were the appointed guardians of the sum of divine revelation,²² and we find also that to the High Priest was committed a mysterious power of receiving divine illumination touching difficult questions.²³ He was the head of the hierarchy—not indeed as the source of Orders, for the priests were such by birthright—but as the main recipient of divine illumination. All this and more, then, must belong to the New Testament priesthood. The "High Priest forever," whom the Levitical High Priest symbolized or prefigured, was the source of all power and authority; and precisely as it was requisite that the Levitical priests should succeed one another for the sake of successive generations of the faithful, so, too, those priests who no longer symbolize Christ and His authority, but who stand in His place and are called His Vicegerents must succeed one another and also Him who is the source of their authority, each in his degree, but one of them actually *in loco Christi*, as St. Thomas expresses it.²⁴

Bearing in mind the distinction thus indicated we can speak of faith as "divine," "divine-Catholic" and "ecclesiastical." These three qualifications express the immediate motives for our assent in each case; thus faith is called *divine* if the immediate motive for assent is the fact that the point in question is divinely revealed, *e. g.*, a saint who receives a divine revelation believes it with divine faith. Faith is Catholic, or *divine-Catholic*, if that revelation comes to us through the medium of the Church, *e. g.*, we accept the articles of faith as well as dogmas and what are termed "theological conclusions in the wider sense"²⁵ because it is through the medium of the

²² E. g., Deut. xxxi., 26.

²³ Exod xxviii., 30, cp. Deut. xxxlii., 8, Ps. xlii., 3.

²⁴ Supra.

²⁵ "Theological conclusions," i. e., conclusions derived from a premise which is revealed and from another which is a naturally known truth, fall into two classes: (a) Those in which the conclusion is contained in the premisses in the same way as the part is contained in the whole, so that really there is hardly a strict deduction to be drawn, *e. g.*, Christ died for all men; but I am a man; therefore Christ died for me. This is a "conclusion" in the wide sense only and is adhered to with divine faith. (b) Those in which there is scope for a strict deduction. These are "conclusions" in the strict sense, since it is only through the medium of such deduction that their connection with the premisses is arrived at; *e. g.*, Christ is a man; but man has the capacity for laughter; therefore Christ is capable of laughter. Such conclusions come under ecclesiastical faith, which reposes on the assistance promised to the Church.

Catholic Church that we know they have been revealed. But "dogmatic facts, *e. g.*, that the "Augustinus" of Jansenius really does contain in substance the five condemned propositions, are accepted by us not because revealed—for there never could have been any revelation of such a fact—but simply by reason of the divine assistance promised to the Church for the safeguarding of the deposit of faith originally delivered and committed to her. This is termed *Ecclesiastical* faith. It may be well to explain what is meant by a "dogmatic fact." The technical expression is not meant to include particular or personal "facts"; of such St. Thomas remarks that "when it is question of particular facts, *e. g.*, of rights of possession, of crimes committed, or anything of that sort, it is possible for the judgment of the Church to err."²⁶ But the term "dogmatic fact" is used in reference to any "fact" or "deed" whereby some doctrine is expressed or which is connected with doctrine. For instance, the question may arise whether a certain opinion agrees or not with revealed doctrine, and also whether a certain formula or some book or some series of acts really do endorse such an opinion. Thus the Jansenists did not deny that certain opinions were in conflict with revealed truth, but they denied that such opinions were really to be found in the "Augustinus" of Jansenius. It will be patent that it is impossible to restrict the Church's infallibility to determining whether the opinion in question is in conflict with revelation. The Church—if she is to safeguard revelation with efficacy—must be able to detect the existence of such an error. A blind man may know that he is in a room full of enemies, but unfortunately he cannot see them and so cannot defend himself against them. This is of particular interest in view of the Papal Letter "Apostolicæ Curæ," of September 13, 1896, for the Supreme Pontiff therein says: "Since, then, to this vital (*intimo*) lack of due 'form' there is added lack of intention such as is equally demanded for the presence of a Sacrament. * * * We, in complete and entire agreement with the decrees of Our predecessors on this point, confirming them, too, in the fullest manner and as it were renewing them by Our authority, of Our own motion and with full knowledge, pronounce and declare that ordinations performed in accordance with the Anglican rite are absolutely null and void." The Pope has here declared that a certain formula is insufficient for conveying true Orders. He has not attempted to decide any purely historical fact, *e. g.*, whether Parker or Barlow were really consecrated or not. He has simply decided a dogmatic fact precisely in the same fashion that Innocent X. decided the question whether Jansenius' language did or did not enshrine certain heretical opinions. Thus the dec-

²⁶ "Quodlibet" IX., art. 16.

laration about Anglican Orders has at least one of the qualifications requisite for an *ex cathedra* statement; whether the other conditions are present, *e. g.*, whether this declaration can be described as intended to be binding upon the Universal Church, since it is a question which only concerns a portion of Christendom, may be disputed.

We are now in a position to examine what may seem a very technical point indeed. Divine faith, as we have seen, is concerned solely with the deposit of faith or with revelation, and infallibility is promised the Church solely with a view to safeguarding this deposit. Consequently we cannot be asked to accept with divine faith anything which is not in that deposit or connected with it. Hence it has been urged that the *Deposit, Divine Faith and Infallibility* are three correlative terms and that the last named, *viz.*, infallibility, can only come into play when it is question of deciding what has to be believed with divine faith as actually contained in the deposit. Now a proposition would—if contradictory to the contents of the deposit—be heretical; if opposed to a truth not directly contained in the deposit, but directly deducible from that deposit, it would be erroneous rather than heretical, and error as well as heresy are opposed to divine faith. Consequently the promise of infallibility comes into play in either case. But supposing that a proposition is condemned not as heretical or erroneous, but as *male sonans*, or “offensive to pious ears,” or as “rash and temerarious,” then—so it has been urged—such a proposition is neither directly nor indirectly opposed to the deposit and therefore cannot be the object of an act of divine faith, neither can the infallibility come into play regarding it. Indeed it is at least conceivable that a proposition may be “offensive to pious ears” and yet be true, *e. g.*, *Sancta Maria Magdalena, meretrix, ora pro nobis*; the same might be said of a proposition which was condemned as “rash.” The further conclusion has been drawn that so long as Papal decrees do not condemn propositions as “heretical” or “erroneous,” there is no scope for the exercise of the prerogative of infallibility and that consequently such pronouncements are not *ex cathedra*, and the censures leveled against them are not infallibly deserved. This theory has something most seductive about it, since it not only has a show of reason in its favor, but it seems to afford us precisely what we want, *viz.*, a sharp dividing line between infallible and fallible judgments. We should in accordance with this view be able to take any declaration and decide at once whether it was infallible or not by discovering whether the opposite doctrine was declared to be really heretical or erroneous or whether it was merely termed “temerarious.” And we could extend the process because we should

à fortiori be in a position to say that when in a given case the subject matter treated of was purely philosophical, *e. g.*, in the condemnations of Gunther and Hermes, and since philosophical truth had nothing to do with the deposit of divine faith, there could be no room here for the prerogative of infallibility to come into play. But speculative theology is always fearful of what we may call "clear-cut decisions." There is so much that we do not know, so much from which the Church has ever shrunk from pronouncing upon, that a wise man hesitates when he is told that any particular theological problem is capable of clear-cut decision. Moreover, the very fact that condemned propositions can be, as in fact they are, so minutely subdivided according to the precise character of the censure attached to them, will at least make us feel that the dividing line between each class of censure is exceedingly fine; we shall feel that divisions must needs so overlap that it becomes difficult to say that because a proposition is only labeled "temerarious" it is therefore in no sense heretical.

As a matter of fact the case against this view is practically overwhelming. When we first learned to play cricket we often yearned to have a bat which was wider than the wicket. But we were told that cricket was a game of skill and that it would be unsportsmanlike to widen the bat. Now safeguarding of the deposit of faith is no game of skill. It is deadly earnest, and comparison should be drawn rather with some contest wherein life itself is at stake, and where, if we are to be certain of winning, the shield must perforce be wider than the vulnerable portions of the body. The truth is that while the deposit, divine faith and infallibility are in fact three correlative terms it does not follow that they are therefore co-extensive. Faith must be more extended than the deposit, for all concede that we have to give the assent of divine faith to things which are only indirectly contained in the deposit. The stock example of this is of course the infallibility of the Church in declaring what are known as dogmatic facts, *e. g.*, to repeat, that a certain treatise contains certain propositions implicitly if not explicitly. If the Church could be mistaken for instance in saying that in the "Augustinus" Jansenius really did set forth the five condemned propositions, even though they are not to be discovered verbatim therein, then the Church would have proved herself unable to safeguard the deposit. Thus if a certain proposition is condemned as "rash," that means that to hold it is to hold what is conducive to error. But if I am free to say that the Church may be mistaken in declaring that this is a "rash" proposition it is hard to see by what right I say that the Church cannot err when she declares that particular proposition is actually erroneous. We could not call a fencer invulnerable if

he only knew the guards wherewith to ward off directly deadly thrusts; it matters little whether he bleeds to death slowly from a multitude of pin-pricks or speedily from one lunge. Similarly if the Church were capable of making a mistake regarding a heresy she would die outright; if she could err on a multitude of minor points she would die by inches only, but still she would die. It was for this reason that the theologians of the Vatican Council insisted that the prerogative of infallibility was the necessary consequence of the Church's indefectibility; if the Church cannot fail neither can she err.

As a matter of fact this precise question, *viz.*, the extension of infallibility to truths which were not strictly dogmas, was discussed in a private congress of the Council. After they had examined a difficult passage in Cardinal Cajetan's Commentary on St. Thomas' "Summa Theologica," IIa., IIae., i., 10, where Cajetan's words seemed at first sight to limit *ex cathedra* decisions to dogmas, the fathers point out that the term "cathedra" or "See" is synonymous with the authority or teaching power belonging to the See of Peter; this, they say, is restricted to doctrine touching the faith, but to say that it is restricted simply to dogmas is arbitrary and not in accordance with the teaching of the early fathers. They close their discussion with these words: "It is not necessary that the definition in question should be limited simply to those things which are to be believed with divine faith; at the same time we are convinced that the present definition should not at this moment be explicitly extended so as to cover other truths."²⁷

Moreover, in the original schema of the Dogmatic Constitution "De Fide Catholica" was contained a Canon subsequently omitted: "If any one shall say it is lawful to hold or teach opinions condemned by the Church, *provided such opinions are not condemned as heretical*, let him be anathema." This Canon was in fact omitted, but not because it was rejected by the Conciliar Fathers. For the Bishop of Poitiers has told us "that the Fathers after mature deliberation thought it would be better that so momentous a declaration as this, one, too, which was so exceedingly necessary, should be more fully and clearly set forth in another Constitution wherein the doctrinal and judicial power of the Church should be directly and professedly treated."²⁸ In fact the doctrine had been already laid down in the "Syllabus," 22, which declared erroneous the proposition that "the obligation whereby Catholic teachers and writers are strictly bound is limited simply to those points which are laid down as binding on the belief of all men

²⁷ "Coll. Lacensis," 1709.

²⁸ "Coll. Lacensis," VII., 208 and 1632.

since they are dogmas of the faith decided by the infallible judgment of the Church."²⁹

This point is also clearly set forth by the Bishop of Brescia in his "Relatio," delivered at one of the sessions of the Vatican Council. "The infallibility is promised," he says, "for the safeguarding and the unfolding of the entire deposit of faith. Hence in general it is clear that the subject-matter of infallibility is doctrine touching faith and morals. But then not all truths concerning Christian faith and morals are of the same order, nor are all of them necessary in the same degree for safeguarding the integrity of the deposit." He then points out that the infallibility promised is the same for the Pope as for the Church, that it extends to the fundamental dogmas of the faith, and that it therefore extends to dogmatic facts. It is disputed, he goes on to say, whether its extension to dogmatic facts is in itself merely a theological conclusion or whether it is actually a dogma of the faith, with the necessary consequence that denial of the extension of infallibility to such dogmatic facts would involve heresy. It was unanimously decided, we are told, to leave this point undefined, while affirming that we must believe of Papal infallibility on this head precisely what we believe of the Church's infallibility on the subject.³⁰

And as with faith, so with morals, the Church has the guardianship of the traditional practices as she has that of the traditional beliefs. The reason of this is that practice and faith are indissolubly connected. Rubrics enshrine dogmas and protect them. Similarly, disciplinary practices are the outward expression of faith and cannot be disregarded without imperiling the reality of our beliefs.

V.

The next qualification for an *ex cathedra* decision is that it must be concerned with something which "is to be held by the Universal Church." As pointed out already, it is not said that it must be concerned with something to be *believed*, but to be *held*. This expression was used partly because the term "believed" could not very well be applied to morals, but partly also because it was intended to signify that the infallibility was not strictly limited by actual dogmas, but of necessity extended to things which did not directly come under divine faith, but were only indirectly concerned with it. See what has been said above on the correlative character of the Deposit, Faith and Infallibility.

The real difficulty with which we are concerned here is the criterion whereby we are to determine whether a particular pronouncement is intended for the whole Church. On what grounds, for

²⁹ Denzinger, I. c., 1722.

³⁰ "Coll. Lacensis," VII., pp. 414-416, cf. 475.

instance, could we claim that the Bull "Apostolicae curae," which treated of Anglican Orders, is not directed to the Universal Church? Is it because it is solely question of "Anglican" Orders, of the Orders of a part as opposed to the whole? But on this plea we should have to rule out of the category of *ex cathedra* pronouncements all those which are directed to individuals, *e. g.*, St. Leo's "Tome," directed to Flavin, and the Encyclical to de Lamennais, "Mirari vos"; yet probably few could be found who would refuse to regard these two Letters as *ex cathedra*. Is it, again, because there is no condemnation of any heresy in it? Yet a Catholic who should deliberately receive Communion at the hands of an Anglican minister would commit idolatry; it is hard to see how such an act would not be heretical. Once more, are we to refuse to regard this pronouncement as directed to the Universal Church because it was simply an answer to an appeal to the Pope from outside? Those who appealed for the decision patently did not regard the Pope as infallible, else they would not have been where they were, *viz.*, outside. They might well say that they appealed to him simply as the Head of Christendom. But would that preclude the Pope from speaking with the plenitude of his Apostolic authority? And since Anglican Orders have an interest for all parts of the world the Papal decision would have effects throughout Christendom. Moreover, it must be remembered that the decision was not meant solely for those "outside"; for among the protagonists of the cause were priests subject to the Pope. Further, in the Vatican decree it is expressly declared that the prerogative of infallibility is rendered necessary for the avoidance of schism. And it might be urged that the schism of the Greek owes its persistence precisely to the fact that its Orders are recognized.

VI.

We have held over till the last the crucial qualification of an *ex cathedra* decision, namely that it must be a definition. We pointed out above that even with regard to this expression there was room for cavil. For what precisely constitutes a "definition"? And need the Holy Father use the expression "I define"? Is he free to use synonymous terms? This we have already answered in pointing out that no one can bind the Pope save the Pope himself, and not even he can bind his successor. The Pope, then, is not bound to use the formula, "I define"; he may use any equivalent expression he likes provided it is unambiguous; that is to say, if he is going to bind our consciences we must be able to recognize the fact that he does intend so to bind us. We called this last qualification for an *ex cathedra* decision "crucial," for in a sense it comprises and even gives their real qualifying character to all the fore-

going features which we have spoken of as necessary qualifications of an *ex cathedra* decision; much in the same way that the rational soul elevates and places in the category of specifically human qualities those features which our bodies possess in common with the animal creation. For it is not merely the material presence of one or more of these conditions which makes a pronouncement *ex cathedra*. Thus it is not sufficient to ask whether the Pope is speaking on a point of faith or morals. For when it has been shown that the pronouncement is a doctrinal one it has further to be shown that the Pontiff is speaking as universal doctor, and when both these points have been answered in the affirmative we have to show that he is defining and not merely setting forth simple doctrinal instructions. Now a Papal "definition" is a peremptory act; it is expressly said that it emanates from "his supreme Apostolic authority"; it must of necessity be judicial, no mere "obiter dictum," no mere reminder of what the Church has always taught will suffice. It must be an act performed in the deliberate exercise of his fullest authority. We have a good parallel in the case of a sovereign who attends the sittings of Parliament; he may follow the speeches attentively, he may even applaud vehemently and thus show which way his sympathies lie; he may go further and try to induce his Ministers to take a certain line of action. All such acts have a peculiar significance owing to the sovereign's exalted position. But they are not "royal" acts; they are significative, but not authoritative. It is only when he takes pen in hand and signs a royal decree that his action becomes magisterial, definitive and peremptory. We instanced above the Encyclical "*Rerum Novarum*" as a non-doctrinal pronouncement. We might take the Encyclical "*Providentissimus Deus*," on the study of Holy Scripture, as an instance of a doctrinal, but not peremptorily definitive pronouncement. The Pontiff speaks his mind clearly, but nowhere can he be said to define; perhaps the strongest thing he says is that the Higher Criticism is "an inept method." But if we pass to two such Encyclicals as the "*Mirari vos*" of Gregory XVI., in which he condemns de Lamennais, or the "*Pascendi gregis*," of Pius X., in which Modernism is condemned, we feel that we are on different ground. The subject matter is doctrinal, opinions are condemned, positive doctrine is laid down. They bear the impress of peremptory judgments on every page.

This is well expressed by Father Knox when he says: "That which makes these utterances infallible and is at the same time the only sign by which we may know that they are infallible, is the will and intention of the Sovereign Pontiff to teach by means of them the universal flock with the authority that belongs to him as

its divinely constituted pastor. If this intention be wanting, they cannot be infallible; since the Pope is not secure against error as a private theologian, nor even as Head of the Church, when deciding particular questions of fact, or giving counsels to individuals who have asked his advice. The prerogative of infallibility belongs to him solely when he intends to teach the universal flock and at the same time gives outward evidence of this intention by the words he uses or the conventional formalities he adopts. Hence, as an index to the Pope's intention, inferred from a comparison of various dogmatic decrees that have been issued at different times by the Sovereign Pontiffs, we may say that the Pope intends to speak *ex cathedra* and therefore infallibly, whenever in council or from the Apostolic Chair and of his own movement, by word of mouth or written document, as the organ of Jesus Christ whose place he occupies, in the names of SS. Peter and Paul, or in the name and with the authority of the Apostolic See, invoked in formal or equivalent terms, with or without menace of excommunication, he addresses to the whole body of the faithful doctrinal teachings relative to matters directly or indirectly, proximately or remotely connected with the deposit of the faith."³¹

It would seem, then, that the main feature to be looked for in an *ex cathedra* decision is a certain peremptoriness which must inevitably accompany a categoric, definitive pronouncement. It might, indeed, be urged that all Papal pronouncements have a certain peremptoriness about them. This is true because it is the voice of the supreme authority to which we are listening. But the peremptoriness we desiderate, for an *ex cathedra* decision is not simply that which accompanies absolute certainty of what one says, but rather that which characterizes irreformable decisions. There is a vast difference in tone, for instance, between such Encyclicals as the "Immortale Dei," the "Rerum Novarum" and the "Providentissimus Deus" on the one hand—Encyclicals for which no one claims an *ex cathedra* character—and the "Mirari vos" and the "Pascendi gregis" on the other, which are generally thought to be *ex cathedra* pronouncements. This peremptoriness is sometimes merely a general tone of finality, but more usually it is shown in the varying marks of condemnation attached to the doctrines reprobated; they are labeled "heretical," "erroneous," "rash," etc. Sometimes, too, an *anathema* is appended against all who dissent; or, when an actual *anathema* is lacking, its place is taken by strong reprobation of all who uphold the views condemned, *e. g.*, in the Bulls on the "Immaculate Conception" and the "Quanta cura," to which the "Syllabus" is attached. The use of the word "define" or its equivalents is also

³¹ "When Does the Church Speak Infallibly?" 1867, pp. 62-63.

an indication of the peremptoriness called for in a final decision. But while it is clear that the Supreme Pastor is bound by the necessities of the case to show us when he is addressing us formally as such, it cannot be too strongly insisted that he is absolutely free in the means he makes use of to this end. As supreme legislator he is free to use whatsoever formulas he chooses. It is futile to argue that in a matter of such moment we have a right to certainty. In the first place, as we have said, you cannot tie the hands of the supreme legislator. In the next place he alone is judge as to whether such absolute certainty is for our good. The kingdom of heaven is not a question of weight and measure, it is no question of haggling about the precise character of our obligations. Those outside the fold are inclined at times to fancy that the Holy Father speaks for the entire world. Not so. He speaks for the entire world of his children. For them it really matters very little whether a pronouncement is strictly *ex cathedra* and infallible or not, whether they are bound to adhere to it with divine faith or whether it merely involves an exercise of the *pietas fidei*. To listen to certain people one might be tempted to think that a gaping chasm lay between an infallible proposition and one which did not emanate from the use of this prerogative. They almost seem to "snatch a fearful joy" from the thought that a particular declaration does not emanate from the infallible Pastor and consequently has no longer any interest for them. Like certain questions of Probabilism, discussions touching the infallibility or fallibility of certain pronouncements have for a Catholic little more than an academic interest. At the same time they may be led to investigate them simply from a desire to know what in the abstract are the absolute limits within which a Catholic must keep, lest by an excessive rigorism they should frighten off inquirers who look at these things from without and for whom *omne ignotum pro magnifico habetur*.

As a matter of fact, the demand for a further declaration on the criteria which should mark out an *ex cathedra* decision is but a repetition in other words of a famous objection which was urged at the time the Council was sitting. For it was argued that an infallible declaration was rendered valueless by the obvious fact that it could only bind people who were themselves infallibly certain of its infallibility. And this infallible certainty was impossible of attainment by the very definition of infallibility as being "assistance" and not inspiration or revelation. For "assistance" implies of its very nature that the person so assisted himself works. But no one can be infallibly certain that the Pope has in any given instance worked sufficiently to secure such assistance. If, then, an infallible declaration is to be of the slightest use the Pope must of necessity present

us with some infallible means of knowing that such a declaration is infallible. But is it true that we must have infallible certainty that a certain declaration is infallible? All we need is moral certainty. Moreover, infallibility does not in itself depend on the Pope's work, for if he could thus endanger the life of the Church by not working what would become of the Church's indefectibility? Infallibility itself, then, depends on indefectibility. Were it otherwise there would be an end of all that "security" on which St. Augustine so persistently harps and which he summed up in the classic phrase, "*securus judicat Orbis terrarum.*" If it be still further insisted that the Pope perhaps will not work, then we can only answer that his due working, while necessary to the licitness of any *ex cathedra* decision, is not necessary for its validity, and further that God, who has pledged Himself to the end, will not allow the means to fail.

The following declaration by the Bishop of Brescia, to whom it fell to make the formal "Relatio" on Cap. IV. of the Decree, may serve as a convenient summary of what has been said:

"In the first place it is no question of the Pope as a private doctor, nor of the Pope as Bishop and Ordinary of any particular diocese, but of his teaching when he is exercising his functions as Supreme Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians. In the second place, even when the Pontiff is exercising his functions as Supreme Shepherd and Teacher, it is not sufficient for him to make use of any method he chooses in propounding his teaching, but it is requisite that he should manifest his intention of defining doctrine, *viz.*, of putting an end to fluctuating opinions touching some doctrine or point which is to be defined, and this he must do by giving a definitive declaration and by setting forth that doctrine as what is to be held by the Universal Church. * * * This particular feature and manifest indication of a definition properly so-called he should in some sort at least express when he defines a doctrine to be held by the Universal Church."³²

Without, then, attempting to tie down the Holy Father to any fixed form of words, without endeavoring to make him say, for example, "We wish this to be understood as an infallible declaration," the relator emphatically demands that there should be no ambiguity, "this particular feature and manifest indication of a definition properly so-called he should, in some sort at least express when he defines a doctrine which is to be held by the Universal Church." It must be "a definitive declaration," and what is the criterion of this save its peremptory character?

HUGH POPE, O. P.

³² "Coll. Lacensis," VII., p. 410.

WILLIAM DUNBAR—AN APPRECIATION.

A SINGER of sweet songs, both sacred and profane, was the Franciscan friar, William Dunbar, who lived and wrote back in that quaint and edifying age when Britain was still Catholic and the literature of England was not yet Protestant. He was one of that galaxy of versifiers of those earlier centuries that blazed the way for the greatness of the Elizabethan period of that country's achievement in the world of letters. In fact, we shall have to pass over two hundred years till we come to Shakespeare, before we can find such a genuine love of nature as is expressed in fifteenth century Scottish poetry. In Dunbar one discovers not only a love of natural scenery and material phenomena, but he is both a poet of nature and of nature's God. His writings are endowed with that higher spiritual sense, savoring at times of the mystical, which from the Catholic viewpoint is all important. Sir Walter Scott said of him that he was "a poet unrivaled by any that Scotland has produced." It was Craik that hailed him as "the Chaucer of Scotland," and he further says of him: "Burns is certainly the only name among the Scottish poets that can be placed in the same line with that of Dunbar, and even the inspired ploughman, though the equal of Dunbar in comic power and his superior in depth of passion, is not to be compared with the elder poet either in strength or in general fertility of imagination."

Dunbar belonged to the age of Chaucer. By virtue of the Norman Conquest, it was an age that reflected a new social code, new customs and manners, and above all a new literature. Religion, the Catholic religion, added its powerful influence to the writings of those days, and Dunbar was one of the voices that proclaimed the glory of the Middle English Period. As Chaucer was the herald in England of the dawn that had broken in Italy in the form of the renaissance of art and literature, so was Dunbar, in strength and imaginative power, the equal of Chaucer in Scotland. Learning, which had been confined to the cloister, was now being revived in the open and spread over Europe. Nor is it true, as a false philosophy of literature would point out, that the Reformation was at the bottom of this awakening. There was a renaissance despite the Reformation. In this connection James Patterson in his "Life and Poems of William Dunbar" says: "The history of Dunbar and his works is, in short, a melancholy illustration of the havoc to which the literature of Scotland has been subjected in consequence of the invasions, burnings and destruction committed by 'our auld enemies of England' and the civil broils arising out of our own feuds. The Reformation, too, must have swept away much of the early writings of the

country. With the down-pulling of the monasteries—those rookeries, as Knox expressed it, where the rooks found shelter—must have perished numerous evidences of the culture which shed a lustre on the close of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth centuries. The flames, kindled by an infuriated mob, destroyed in a few days the work of ages, which would have been now the delight and glory of the land. That the cartularies of the larger religious houses did not wholly disappear, we owe in some measure to the cupidity of the neighboring barons, who failed not to procure a long lease or assignation of the best of the church lands, upon easy terms, from the despairing monks prior to the final overturning. In this manner and by crown grants, the monastical charters frequently found their way to the charter-chests of the barons, and many of them have fortunately been preserved.”

Transient as the fame of those early versifiers may have been, however, Dunbar has escaped much of the oblivion which was their lot and he has been largely written about and an anthology of his works has been produced. Our poet was born about the year 1460. He matriculated at St. Andrew's University in 1475, receiving the bachelor's degree in 1477 and the master's degree in 1479. About the year 1480 we find him a novitiate in the Grey Friars' convent at Edinburgh. In 1491 he was honored as a member of the Royal Commission in France, this being the first intimation we have of his being employed by the King, James IV. In 1500 he was pensioned and in attendance at Holyrood; in 1501-2 he was on an embassy to London and was made poet laureate. The date of his death is given as 1522. In James IV., Dunbar had an enviable literary patron. Greenough White says: “James had splendid tastes. He loved music and song; minstrels, rhymers and scholars were welcome at his gay court and gave it a fine lustre. Its greatest literary ornament and, indeed, the chief of Scottish poets throughout the two hundred years' course of independent Scottish literature, was William Dunbar.”

“The research of all the annotators and biographers of William Dunbar, it may well be remembered,” says James Patterson, “has done very little to penetrate the obscurity which the wars, the feuds and the Calvinism of the past have involved his memory. Early in life he became a friar of the Order of St. Francis, or Grey Friars, a branch of whom, the Observantines, was established in Edinburgh by James I., as we know from his own statement in ‘The Visitation of St. Francis.’” He left his convent walls to go through England as a preaching, mendicant friar. Some of his biographers would have us believe that finally he abandoned the garb altogether, disappointed because he received no promotion in the Church. But

inasmuch as he certainly performed Mass in the King's presence, as the royal chaplain, when attending James in his occasional visits to different parts of the country, while he may have left the Franciscans, he performed the functions of a priest and was true to his vows. On March 16, 1504, he received from the King, on the occasion of his (Dunbar's) first Mass, a present of seven French crowns, or about £5 18s. in the money of that period. The worst that can be said of Dunbar was that he was not sufficiently humble and fawned upon his prince's favor to the extent that he was ambitious to become a Bishop. Though he was favored by the King, acting as secretary upon important embassies to continental courts, his benefice was small, amounting to ten pounds yearly, his "silver sorrow." He pleasantly says:

"Of full few freiers that has been sancts I read;
Wherefore gae bring to me ane Bishop's weed."

Dunbar was the greatest of the group of Scottish writers who added brilliancy to the Middle English Period. Their splendid poetry was written in the Northern dialect, which is as much English as the Midland language of Chaucer. Not until the sixteenth century was the dialect called Scotch. A genuine love of nature is revealed in this dawn of the literature of Scotland. It "was an era of sentiment, of a fresh stir of the affections, of freer fancy and humor, of a new pathos," says Greenough White in his "Outline of the Philosophy of English Literature." There was stimulated "among pious souls a more ardent devotion, a warmer coloring was cast over religion, and it became a matter of feeling," all of which is seen in the devotional poetry of Dunbar. Three distinct stages are seen in Dunbar's writings. As a preaching friar and later in his career at court as chaplain to the King and as poet laureate he was still in touch with the world. He could, therefore, write world-wise songs that were largely secular, although many of them have a devotional strain; other of his poems are nature poems such as we might expect a monk to write, or they savor more closely of the cloistered life, being devotional in their subject matter and are largely penitential in tone; while a third class of his poems were probably composed in his last days when his thoughts were withdrawn from the things of this world and confined themselves to spiritual longings and are characterized by spiritual aspirations bordering on the expressions of a mystic who had passed through the stage of purification and had entered upon the second stage of illumination (*illuminatio*), in which his soul reached a higher purity and was filled with a longing for God in His beauty. In this stage of his career he wrote poems of divine love-longing. Dunbar

scarcely advanced to the highest stage of mysticism. He was purely a practical mystic, except perhaps in his last days, when he may have entered upon that third stage of contemplation (*contemplatio*), or the contemplative life, where saintly souls heard things not lawful to utter.

During Dunbar's career as a preaching friar we are told he was not much better nor much worse than some other preaching friars of his day. In his wanderings he preached from the pulpits of Dernton and Canterbury, even crossing the Straits of Dover and exercising his profession through Picardy. In his travels, too, he was guilty of "mony wink and wyle, quhilk mycht be flemit (banished) with na haly water." After he came to live at court and was on familiar terms with the King and Queen, he took part in the festivities, on one occasion even taking part in a dance and: "On all the flure there was nane frackar (more agile)." This was about 1503. He refers to himself when he describes in a poem the antics of a clumsy dancer who upset himself and all the candles. In another poem he complains of a headache which prevents him writing a song upon one of these festive occasions. The poems he wrote as a friar were often indecent and irreverent. One of them is a profane parody of the litanies. But a change for the better came over Dunbar and he played his role well as a priest and as chaplain to King James. The change is noticeable in his moral and religious poetry. Some commentators see in the change in his writings a sadness and a melancholy. It is only that he struck more serious chords of a religious nature, having tired of the world and its vanities. From a Catholic point of view, this period of his life and writings is most interesting.

In one of his satirical poems he denounces the vulgar practice of swearing and the roguery which prevailed amongst tradesmen. He gave sound advice to his King to discourage flatterers, sycophants, impostors and oppressors. He did not hesitate to call to task his fellow-friars whose lives were often a scandal. In fact, Dunbar was fearless in denouncing, satirizing and ridiculing what he deemed wrong, just as he was ever ready to applaud what he considered to be right. But there is nothing to suggest that he condoned any irregularities or that he himself was contaminated by his contact with the ways of the court. On the contrary, he does not hesitate to chide even the King himself, who evidently took the good counsel in the spirit that it was given and would retire to some monastery, even though he did return to the revelries of the court again after such periods of penance. It is a pretty safe guess that the good friar did not let the monarch deviate too far from the straight and narrow path. In his "Dirge to the King" at Sterling he mixes his prime

and second lessons and responses of the breviary with expressions of pity for the King away from Edinburgh's joy and bliss and in retreat at Sterling town. For His Majesty had gone thither as was his wont to do penance. "Dirige," contracted to "dirge," is the first word of a penitential psalm, of which it is a profane parody. He sings in praise of womankind, quite chivalrously declaring that "all women of us should have honoring, service and love, above all other things." In another poem he condemns the cunning and craftiness of the merchants of Edinburgh. But while he abuses Edinburgh, in still another poem he praises the city of London, "the flower of cities all." In noble verses he welcomes Princess Margaret on her arrival at Holyrood. No lyricist of the Elizabethan age sings a sweeter song, fresh and fragrant with the dawn of that earlier lyric day, than does our poet in "The Thistle and the Rose," which begins:

"When March was with variand windis past
And April had, with her silver showers,
Tane leif at nature with ane orient blast;
And lusty May, that mother is of flowers,
Had made the birds to begin their hours
Among the tender odors red and white,
Whose harmony to her it was delight;
In bed at morrow, sleeping as I lay,
Me thought Aurora, with her crystal eye,
In at the window lukit by the day," etc.

We need often to refer to a glossary while reading Dunbar, but we cannot help but fall under the sweet suasion of the lilt and beauty of his rhythmical cadences. The "Golden Targe" has been called "the most purely ideal of all of Dunbar's writings." It will suffice to quote the following stanzas to show how beautifully he could write:

"Rycht as the sterne of day began to schyne,
Quhen gone to bed was Vesper and Lucyne,
I raiss, and by a roseir did me rest;
Up sprang the golden candill matatyne,
With cleir depurit (purified) bemys christallyne,
Glading the mirry fowlis in thair nest;
Or Phebus wes in purpour kaip revest,
Up raiss the lark, the hevinis menstrall fyne,
In May, in till a morrow mirthfullest.

"The crystal air, the saphyrs firmament,
The ruby skies of the orient,

Cast beiriall beams on emerant bow'rs green;
 The rosy garth (garden) depaint and redolent
 With purple, azure, gold and *goulis gent* (beautiful red)
 Arrayed was, by Dame Flora the queen,
 So nobily, that joy was for to seen;
 The rock again the river resplendent
 As low enluminat all the leaves sheen."

In his poems which are not distinctly religious, Dunbar moralizes well against the vanity of the world and the pride of life. In "This World's Vanitee" he sings:

"Since a' that ever lived are gane,
 Since we but tarry till we're ta'en,
 Best is that we for Death prepare
 By taking in this world we share."

Another time he tells us: "Within this world there's naething sure." He ejaculates:

"Lord! since in time, so soon to come,
 De terra surrecturus sum,
 What needs I care for earthly care?
 Tu regni da imperium
 For here at least there's naething sure."

He antedates Shakespeare with

"*The world's a stage*, and he plays best wha best himself
 can guide."

Learning, he says, is vain without good life and tells us that "without good life all in the self does die." "A perilous life is vain prosperitie," he urges. In "The Vanity O't," he sings:

"Right weel we ken that fail we must;
 The strongest body is but dust,
 And shall to dust return again:
 Surely the strength of man is vain."
 "Yet since 't is fate that rules it a',
 And life's short day slips fast awa',
 Let 's tak' the pleasure wi' the pain—
 It has its value though it 's vain."

And again:

"Man, please thy Maker an' be merry,
 And set not by the world a cherry,
 Work for the place of paradise
 For therein reigns nae covetice."

Again he meditates:

“Despair is ever at my side,
‘Provide,’ he cries; ‘in time provide:
Ye’ve wair’d (spent) or waistit a’ your prime:
Now think upon your latter time—
How will ye live? whaur will ye bide?”

“And then says Age—‘My friend, come near;
Why shouldst thou start when I appear?
Come, brother, by the hand me tak’:
Remember thou hast count to mak’
Of a’ the time thou spendest here.’”

One of Dunbar’s famous poems is “The Dance of the Seven Deadly Sins.” The poet pictures himself spending the eve of Lent in hell, where the seven deadly sins perform a dance. They are surrounded by human souls who in life were slaves of these sins. He leads off the dance with Pride, because “by that sin fell the angels:”

“And first of all in dance was Pryd,
With hair wyl’d back, bonet on side.”

Anger comes in “with strut and strife: His hand was ay upon his knife.” Boasters, braggarts and bargainers follow after in pairs. They dance and smite one another with their swords, or run each other through with them to the very hilt. It is Anger that knows no bounds with all its attending evils, causing strife and murder. No other poem that Dunbar wrote is so characteristic of the times in which he lived as this particular poem. It reflects the mediævelism of Dante; but while it resembles the great Tuscan in its subject-matter, it is replete with a grim humor that belongs to the freshness of the Renaissance period. A cloistered monk could not have written it, but only one who from under his friar’s cowl had looked in upon the revelries of the court, and who forthwith took this means to preach a goodly sermon. In his poem Dunbar does not sacrifice literary art to the devotional lyric. Instead he gives us a poem that describes the seven deadly sins not as he would a table of sins, but dwells upon them in a poetic manner; as Dante has poetized with the help of his imagination the scholastic teachings and doctrines of the Church.

In Dunbar’s day the religious lyrics were written either by mystics themselves or by poets that had come under the influence of mystic thought and experience. Says Dr. Frank Allen Patterson in his monograph on the Middle English penitential lyric: “Under the impelling love of God, which mysticism had aroused, there were

written tracts, homilies, legends and poems whose purpose was to create in the ignorant laity a deep religious life. So it came about that, though Latin was retained in the formal church services, preserving more perfectly the dignity and reverential awe suitable to public worship, the vernacular came into use for the more practical purposes of the active life. From using the common language for the purpose of religious teaching, it was but a step to expressing that teaching in poetical form, always more pleasing to the popular ear and more easily remembered." Dunbar, therefore, in going about as a preaching friar, naturally conveyed his teaching in verse as when he tells how to confess one's sins properly and efficaciously, and presented a table of sins for the instruction and guidance of the laity. "The missionary spirit," says Dr. Patterson, "the practical side of mysticism, was the leading motive in the development of the vernacular religious lyric." It was a phase of mysticism which accounted for the liturgical lyrics, as the writer further points out. "Even in Dunbar," he states, "the missionary spirit is easily read between the lines. Poetry as a means of religious instruction or as a mode for expressing divine emotion," he says further, "became popular in a manner that was doubtless unknown in England before. Every kind of religious feeling found expression in verse; prayers fell naturally into rhyme and sermons took the likeness of poetry. Friars found it convenient to set forth in easily remembered verse the simple teachings of the faith, and monks in their monasteries turned irresistibly in their adoration for (*i. e.*, to say, devotion to) Mary to expression in song; even the lonely hermit having reached the glories of a union with God, exclaimed: 'the(y) sang of louyng & of lufe es commen.' " This explanation makes for a better understanding of the character of Dunbar's poetry, notably in his devotional hymns to the Blessed Virgin, in his "Manner of Passing to Confession," and in his mystic utterances of the love of God.

Dunbar has penned two beautiful ballads to Our Lady which rank among the best of the hymns to Mary which are to be found in the devotional poetry of the Middle English Period. In ballad number one he thus acclaims the Mother of God:

"Imperial wall, place palestrall,
Of peirles pulcritude;
Tryumphal hall, hie trone regall
Of Gode's celsitude;
Hopsitall riall, the Lord of all
Thy closset did include;
Bricht ball, cristall, rois virginall,
Fulfillit of angell fude.

Ave Maria, gratia plena!
Thy birth has with His blude,
Fra fall mortall, virginall,
Us ransomid on the rude."

In metre and matter ballad number two runs thus:

"Madyne meik, most mediatrix for man,
And moder myld, full of humilite!
Pray thi sone Jhesu, with his woundis wan,
Quhilk deinyit him for our trespass to de,
And as he bled his blude apoun a tre,
Us to defend fra Lucifer our fa,
In hevyne that we may syng apoun our kne:
O mater Jhesu, salue Maria!"

In one of his religious poems, "Of the Nativity of Christ," the poet has still another beautiful reference to Mary:

"Rorate Coeli desuper!
Heavens distil your balmy show'rs,
For now is risen the bright day-star,
Fro the Rose Mary, flow'r of flow'rs:
The clear sun, whom no cloud devours,
Surmounting Phœbus in the cart,
Is coming of his heav'nly tow'rs;
Et nobis Puer natus est."

We are deeply indebted to Dr. Patterson for the proper interpretation of the penitential lyric poetry of the Middle English Period. "Penance, the Church has always held," says this author, "is the first duty of the sinner. The mystics laid much emphasis upon this sacrament; St. Bernard declared the 'first sacrifice to be made to God is a troubled and contrite heart,' and every mystic treatise affirmed that the chief arts of purification were those connected with penitence." To this division belong the poems of Dunbar concerning confession. In a poem which tells of man's mortality and which ranks among the best of Dunbar's moral poems, one verse runs as follows:

"Though all this world thou did posseid,
Nocht after death thou sall possess,
Nor with thee tak, but thy guid deed,
When thou does fro this world thee dress:
So speed thee, Man, and thee confess,
With humble heart and sober teiris,
And sadly in thy heart impress,
Quod tu in cinerem revertiris."

The predominating emotion of Dunbar's religious poetry is a sorrow for sin, wherein he thinks of his past life and of future judgment. His poems are what Dr. Patterson would call contrition or, again, confession poems in which the main feeling is (1) a sorrow for sin, or (2) a purpose of amendment. And as he explains: "A confession is a poem in which the main emotion is an acknowledgment of sin." He divides the confession poems into two classes, public and extended confessions. "The public confession is the *confiteor* that was used in all the Western churches. It consisted of two parts: the confession proper, in which acknowledgment of sin was made, and the prayer for intercession with which it closed. Extended confessions are a further development of liturgical poems. They consisted of a detailed rehearsal of sins, using the Ten Commandments, the five wits, the seven deadly sins and other conventional enumerations of error and wrongdoing." Dunbar's confession poems are two in number: "The Manner of Passing to Confession" and "The Table of Confession." These poems he wrote as verse homilies when he was a parish priest and are distinctly meant for the instruction of penitents. In his poem entitled "The Manner of Passing to Confession," Dunbar, like Chaucer in the "Priest's Tale," urges the necessity of full and clear confession and to tell one's sins with all the circumstance, as when he says:

"Of twenty wounds, and ane be left unhealit,
 What avails the leeching of the lave (rest)
 Richt sa thy shrift, and there be ocht concealit,
 It avails not thy silly soul to save;
 Nor yet of God remission for to have:
 Of sin gin thou wuld have deliverance,
 Thou suld it tell with all the circumstance."

The second poem, "The Table of Confession," is a table of sins in verse, and was meant as an aid to the laity in examining the conscience preparatory to receiving the sacrament of penance. The most striking sentiment about it all is the last recurring line of each stanza: "I cry Thee mercy, and leisure to repent." Herein the penitent is made to pray for forgiveness and the privilege of not being cut off in his sins, "unhousel'd, disappointed, unaneled." But here are the stanzas:

"To Thee, to Thee alone, Redeemer mine,
 My King, my Friend, my gracious Saviour sweet,
 Before Thy bleeding body I incline,
 And for my sins forgiveness thus entreat,

That ever I did, up to this hour complete,
In act, or word, or unexpressed intent;
Down on my knees, full low before Thy feet,
I mercy beg, and leisure to repent.

"Lord, I confess that I neglected have
Sweet Mercy's code, in spirit and in letter;
Nor meat nor money to the starving gave;
Nor saw the sick, nor sought to make them better;
Nor clad the naked; nor relieved the debtor;
Nor of poor waifs and wayfarers took tent;
And would have passed the Magdalen had I met her:
I mercy beg, and leisure to repent.

"Thy wise commands—to honour Thee alone;
Nor take Thy name in vain; nor thief to be;
To covet no man's aught, pleased with my own;
Falsehood to shun, and youthful lusts to flee;
To act obedient to a parent's see;
To follow none with murderous intent:
Lord, for a broken law I bow (bow) to Thee,
And mercy beg, and leisure to repent.

"Though I have not Thy precious feet to kiss,
As Magdalen had when she did mercy crave,
I'll weep like her for all I've done amiss,
And every morning seek Thee at Thy grave:
Therefore forgive me as Thou her forgave;
Thou know'st my heart, like hers, is penitent;
And grant, ere I the sacrament receive,
Pardon, and love, and leisure to repent."

In his old age Dunbar wrote of Love, Earthly and Divine, indicating that he had withdrawn his affections from things of the world to those of heaven. It has not, however, the beauty and fine treatment of the same theme in that much earlier production, which is his best moral poem, "The Merle and the Nightingale." It is a scholastic disputation in verse in keeping with his character as an ecclesiastic. In it are discussed the comparative merits of earthly and heavenly love. The merle sings of earthly love and passion, claiming that "a lusty life in love's service been." But the nightingale contends: "All love is lost but upon God alone."

"The Merle said, Love is cause of honour aye,
Love makes cowards manhood to purchase,
Love makes knightly hardy at assay,
Love makes wretched full of largeness,

Love makis swear folkis full of business,
 Love makis sluggardis fresh and *weil besse* (neat),
 Love changes Vice in Virtue's nobleness;
 A lusty life in lovis service been.

"The Nightingale said, True is the contrary,
 Sic frustis (vain) love it blindis men so far,
 In to their minds it makes thame to vary;
 In false, vain glory they so drunken are,
 That wit is went, of woe they are not 'ware,
 While that all worship away be fro them gone,
 Fame, guids and strength; wherefor' weil say I dare
 And love is lost but upon God alone."

H. B. Bailden tells us that "Dunbar had had a hard and even bitter life, whose sufferings, if they left him finally chastened in soul, may well have stamped their rugged traces on his countenance." The same authority tells us that Dunbar before his death "retired from court, probably to a country benefice, where he died without public notices fulfilling, we will hope the Italian proverb to which he refers,

" 'The love of God most deir to man suld be
 All love of God is lost bot upon him allone' ;

and, having been somewhat worldly in his youth, dying an 'old saint.' " As the last of his days drew near, Dunbar penned that pathetic poem of his, "Lament for the Makaris." At the close of each verse recurs the line:

"Timor mortis conturbat me."

Referring to what he calls the "Timor Mortis" lyrics, Dr. F. A. Patterson says: "It is clear that he (Dunbar) took his refrain, 'timor mortis conturbat me,' and other lines from those popular songs on the fear of death." The refrain is that of Lydgate's poem, "Timor Mortis Conturbat Me," and this refrain, like many Latin others, is borrowed from the liturgical offices of the dead. In his poem, Dunbar moralizes as to the world's vanity, and the instability of all things, as when he says of death:

"He takes the champion in the stour (storm of battle),
 The captain closit in the tour,
 The lady in bour, full of beautie:"

And so concludes—

“Sen he has all my brether ta’en,
He will not live me alane,
On forse I maun his next prey be:
Timor mortis conturbat me.
Sen for the Death remeid is none,
Best is that we for death dispone,
After our death that live may we;
Timor mortis conturbat me.”

In conclusion, we may address Dunbar's “finer spirit” in the words of Hugh Haliburton:

“The mysteries of life and death
Opprest thee, as they press us now;
Therefore is thine living breath—
Our secret cares still speakest thou.”

And so a consideration of William Dunbar is not wasted effort in keeping green for the sake of an “auld lang syne” of Catholic faith and morals, the memory of an old makar, whose sage advice and pious meditations still impart their salutary lessons to the soul.

JOSEPH B. JACOBI.

Baltimore, Md.

ARCHBISHOP TALBOT.

THE beatification of Oliver Plunket calls to mind another champion of the faith in Ireland during the dark days of the penal laws. This was Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin. Although he did not suffer martyrdom like the Primate and testify his fidelity by the shedding of his blood, he was still a martyr in the literal sense of the word, for by his sufferings, his imprisonment and his death he was a witness to the truth which he preached and practiced, a victim of the same pitiless persecution which led the Archbishop of Armagh to the scaffold. A member of an ancient and illustrious family that at one time bore the titles of Earls of Wexford and Waterford, he was born in 1620 at Malahide, in the County of Dublin, where in the reign of Henry II., Richard Talbot, who had received a grant of the adjoining lands, built a castle which still stands, though much modernized and exhibiting externally few traces of its mediæval character.¹ He was the sixth son of Sir William Talbot, of Carton, and of Alison, daughter of Lord John Netterville, of Castleton, County Meath. His brother, the celebrated Colonel Richard Talbot, was created Earl of Tirconnell by James II., made Viceroy of Ireland (the last Catholic who held that position), and subsequently raised to the rank of Duke. A descendant of the Earls of Shrewsbury, a branch of which family settled in Ireland, filled very important offices and were noted for their attachment to the Catholic faith, he came of a good stock. In 1635, when he was fifteen, following an attraction to the religious life, he went to Portugal, where he entered the Society of Jesus, to which two of his brothers belonged. After studying philosophy and theology under the guidance of the Jesuits, upon the completion of a brilliant course he received ordination in

¹ Lord Talbot de Malahide's title only dates from 1831, but the Talbot family have been in possession of Malahide since 1174. The oldest part of the castle is as old as that time. In the picture gallery is a painting of the Nativity of Our Lord, which was once an altar-piece in the chapel of the Holyrood Palace, Edinburgh, and belonged to Mary Queen of Scots. It is said to have been painted by Albrecht Durer. In the ruined chapel adjoining the castle is the tomb of the wife of Sir Richard Talbot, who lived in the fifteenth century. This was Maud Plunket, whose first husband was Hussey, son of the Baron of Galtrim, in Meath, who was slain on his wedding day. She was thus maid, wife and widow within twenty-four hours. The incident forms the subject of Gerald Griffin's poem, "The Bridal of Malahide." The Talbots of Carton, Maynooth, were cousins of the Malahide Talbots. The Carmelite College, Terenure, Dublin, once belonged to the Talbot who was Earl of Tirconnell and who died during the siege of Limerick. His widow founded a convent for Poor Clares in North King street, Dublin, which existed up to 1825, when they returned to Galway, from which they had originally come. She was Frances Jennings, sister of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough.

Rome. After returning to Portugal, where he spent some time, he went to Antwerp, where he lectured on moral theology and began to employ his pen in the production of controversial treatises.

At this time Ireland was ruthlessly ravaged by the Cromwellians. After the execution of the ill-fated Charles I. at Whitehall, Charles II. fled to Paris, from whence he went to Cologne in July, 1655, after the conclusion of the treaty between France and the Commonwealth. Endeavoring to gain the assistance of Spain to effect the Restoration, he sent Talbot on a secret mission to the court of Madrid. He could not have sent a better envoy, as he possessed a great deal of influence with the Spanish ministers in Flanders and was besides an intimate friend of the celebrated Irish Dominican, Father Dominic of the Rosary, a native of Kerry, and then ambassador of the King of Portugal at the French court, while his Jesuit connections enabled him to be of great service to Charles, with whom he became very intimate, frequently visiting and conversing with him. Their conversations often turning on the respective merits of the Catholic and Protestant religions, Talbot succeeded in effecting his conversion and privately received him into the Church. Although for politic reasons it was kept secret, his absence from Protestant services was remarked and his Protestant supporters called upon him to deny the rumor of his conversion, which was not only whispered on the Continent, but reported in England, or to make open profession of Protestantism. With characteristic inconstancy, Charles dissembled and, as Dr. Renehan observes,² denied and renounced the convictions of his heart with the same readiness as he pledged his honor or his faith at different times to support and to repudiate the Irish peace, the Scotch Covenant and the English Church. Talbot's labors, however, were not in vain. Though weak of will, the King was at heart a sincere convert, and died a penitent Catholic.³

Talbot conveyed to Philip IV., of Spain, the news of Charles' conversion. It earned for him the bitter hostility of the Protestant party, which pursued him to the end. It was further increased by his anxiety later on to secure to Irish Catholics the terms of the peace of 1648 and the restoration of the estates seized by the Cromwellians, which made the Protestants regard him not so much a rival in royal favor as an opponent who, if not speedily crushed, might eventually dislodge them and destroy all their schemes of rapine and self-aggrandizement. A set was accordingly made upon

² "Collections on Irish Church History," in which the late president of Maynooth devotes twenty-six pages to an outline of Archbishop Talbot's career.

³ See Strickland's "Lives of the Queens of England," Vol. VIII., p. 453, for a detailed account of his last moments. He was prepared for death by Father Huddleston, who had saved his life when Charles was a fugitive.

him, and the most unrelenting and calumnious of his enemies was Sir Edward Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, who seems to have had some grudge against his family. Yet no family deserved better of the Stuarts, being staunch Jacobites. Few men in Ireland had been more devoted to the cause of Charles I. than Sir Edward Talbot, the eldest of his brothers, who along with another, Richard, was imprisoned for six months by Cromwell and lost a large portion of their property. Three of the brothers followed Charles II. into Flanders, and the whole five labored incessantly at home and abroad to bring about his restoration. Yet Hyde, when ambassador in Brussels, strove to undermine them, particularly Peter Talbot, to whom he was personally most hostile, urging Ormond to have him sent out of the way to some remote monastery, and casting unfounded suspicions on his loyalty. They succeeded for a time in effecting a passing estrangement between him and the King. On the death of Oliver Cromwell and the submission of his sons, April, 1659, the Spanish Ministers, who were pledged to the restoration of Charles, were apprehensive that the republican party might gain the ascendancy in England; to obviate this, without consulting the King, they dispatched Talbot to London with directions to unite the friends of Spain and of the monarchy. The King and his English adherents were jealous that the object of this mission had not been concealed from His Majesty, and it was slanderously insinuated that Talbot went to negotiate the terms of peace then proposed by the Commonwealth to Spain. But the King was ultimately satisfied as to the important services to his cause rendered by Talbot, and Ormond was glad to avail of his influence in Madrid to secure a pension promised him by Spain, in which he was successful. He then returned to Bordeaux, where he was living, on May 19, 1660, and from whence he wrote the next day to Ormond, informing him that France and Spain had mutually agreed to bring about the restoration by force of arms if Charles' subjects would not otherwise receive him, but that they would demand liberty of worship for Catholics and the return to the Irish rightful owners of their confiscated estates.

It was during the summer of 1659 he severed his connection with the Jesuits, at the prompting of Peter Walsh, but much to his regret, for he was attached to the Society and its members to him. It is easy to discern the hand of Hyde in an intrigue which led to the Jesuit general sending Talbot an obedience to instantly quit England, with offer of a professor's chair in any other province or college at his choice. But, as he said, he saw that through his whole life he could never expect to do as much for his God, his religion, his country and his King as he then had an opportunity of doing by

remaining a few months in England, executing the commission he had received from Spain. Dr. Renehan effectually disposes of Harris' statement, grounded on the unreliable authority of a party pamphlet, "Foxes and Firebrands," and reproduced with modifications and critical deductions by Dalton in his "Archbishops of Dublin," that Talbot was intimate with Cromwell, walked at his funeral in a mourning cloak, which he wore some time after in public, as was then the fashion; that when General Monk declared for the King he marched out with Lambert to oppose the design and fled the kingdom on the Restoration. Instead of Talbot being intimate with Cromwell and being in London from before the death of the usurper until after the Restoration, Lord Chancellor Hyde informs the Marquis of Ormond in a letter dated October 11, 1659 (seven months before the Restoration), that he had left England some time before that, and in another, dated October 25, that he was in the neighborhood of Bayonne. There are extant letters from Talbot to Ormond and others from Spain and France from October, 1659, to May 20, 1660, three weeks after the formal reinstatement of Charles. He never saw Cromwell. Harris admits that he went to the Continent in 1635, being then but fifteen years of age, and did not return to England from that date till he was sent over by Spain on the death of Cromwell. Harris' whole story about Talbot and Cromwell Dr. Renehan characterizes as "a tissue of calumnious mistakes."

The important trusts committed to Father Talbot's management by the King's Ministers did not allow him to return from the Continent to share in the triumph of the Restoration, but in a few months he went to the English court, where he was well received. It was at the time when the Queen Dowager and Princess Henrietta arrived there. On the King's marriage to Catherine of Braganza, the Infanta of Portugal, a marriage which gave England its first foothold in India, he was appointed one of the Queen's almoners, an appointment which Clarendon strove in vain to prevent, though he subsequently succeeded in getting him deprived of an office which he valued more for the facilities it afforded him in the exercise of his priestly ministry than for any honors or emoluments. "Could his charitable soul delight in revenge," observes Dr. Renehan, "it might have been fully gratified when he saw that same Chancellor that very year impeached for treason, and when a few years after he saw him deprived of the great seal, impeached a second time for high treason, obliged to fly from trial to France, and the Parliament issuing a decree of perpetual banishment against him and ordering his defense to be burned by the common executioner." The greater portion of Talbot's time on the Continent was spent in Flanders. As an

ecclesiastic he appears to have been more appreciated abroad than at home, winning respect by his uncompromising integrity, piety and high principle. Although Cardinal Moran says he was the victim of Ormond's enmity when the persecution was renewed in Ireland, Dr. Renehan observes that "the vehement zeal and obstinate adherence of his family to the Ormond policy and the peace of 1648 made him the object of suspicion to the ultra-Catholic party and stimulated the friends of Rinuccini to endeavor to procure his expulsion from the Jesuit college at Rome when he went to study there," while "his zeal to promote the Catholic religion and his persevering efforts to serve his country and to prevent that wholesale spoliation effected by the miscalled Act of Settlement drew on him the furious hatred of many of those who were wholly intent on enriching themselves by the plunder of the Irish estates."

In 1664 the Internuncio in Brussels wrote offering to have him appointed to a bishopric. In his misplaced confidence he showed the letter to the too-famous friar, Peter Walsh, in whom he still trusted. He could not have selected a worse counsellor than the author of the Remonstrance, an intriguing and ambitious priest, to whom he said that he would not accept a mitre without the approbation of Ormond, then Viceroy of Ireland, and that he was personally indifferent whether he was or was not promoted to the episcopate. The sees of Dublin and Armagh were then vacant. Walsh confidently expected to be nominated to Dublin and his friend Caron to Armagh. It was certain that these two sees would be provided for before less important ones would be filled. As soon as Talbot opened his mind to him, he decided that he must prevent at any cost his selection or his own chance of promotion would be lost. That day he went to Ormond, then in London, and told him that he had discovered a plot of the Talbots to procure the assassination of the Viceroy. Ormond believed or affected to believe this incredible story, and instead of approving of Talbot's appointment, imprisoned his three brothers. When they were brought to trial their innocence was proved. But the false charge so far served the purpose of the calumniator that the Church in Ireland was for a time deprived of a Bishop and Richard Talbot of his estate. How little Peter Talbot ambitioned being mitred may be inferred from the fact that when later he heard of his intended promotion, he went to Father Joseph Simons, then provincial of the Jesuits in England, and offered to rejoin the Society of Jesus if he or Father Oliva, the general, deemed that course more conducive to the interests of religion, but they, wisely deciding otherwise, renounced their claim upon him and used all their influence to forward his promotion.

At the close of the year 1668 there were only two Catholic Bishops living in Ireland, Dr. Patrick Plunket, Bishop of Ardagh, and Dr. Owen McSweeney, Bishop of Kilmore. On the Continent three other members of the Irish hierarchy, the Bishop of Kilfenora, the Bishop of Ferns and the Archbishop of Armagh, lived in exile "No wonder, then," says Cardinal Moran, "that the widowed churches of Ireland should have hailed with joy the 21st of January, 1669, the day on which the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda nominated four new Bishops to vacant sees: *i. e.*, Dr. Peter Talbot to the archiepiscopal See of Dublin, Dr. William Burgatt to Cashel, Dr. James Lynch to Tuam, and Dr. Phelan to Ossory. During this period of persecution our Irish hierarchy was more than once on the verge of destruction, and if our Church at the present day does not present the sad desolation of England and Scotland, we are indebted under heaven to those indefatigable men who labored in season and out of season to preserve unbroken, despite the efforts of the enemies of our holy faith, the succession of our chief pastors.⁴ Consecrated Archbishop of Dublin at Antwerp on Sunday, May 8 (styl. vet.), 1669, Dr. Talbot left Brussels on the 28th of that month, hastening to London in order (his eyes now being opened to the character and designs of his quondam false friend) to oppose Peter Walsh and his famous "Remonstrance," and what he designates as "his infamous efforts against God, the King and his country"; having obtained a Brief authorizing him to exercise the prerogatives and privileges of the Pallium until such time as he should be formally invested with it. One of his first episcopal acts was to unite with the Bishop of Ferns in constituting Dr. Oliver Plunket, who had already been for some time agent in Rome for his relative, the Bishop of Ardagh, the representative in the Roman court for the newly appointed Bishops, including the Province of Dublin; "well knowing," he wrote to the future Primate, "your zeal for the faith and the affection you bear your friends, and that you will correspond to the confidence placed in you, and give full satisfaction to all." In the same letter, noting that there was such confusion in the Province of Armagh, the see being then vacant through the death of Dr. Edmund O'Reilly at Paris in March, 1669, he adds that he proposed three names for the selection of a successor in the Primacy: Dr. Patrick Everard, a learned Jesuit of noble and ancient lineage, rector of the Irish College at Antwerp, who had studied in Seville, had suffered much for the faith for thirty-six years and was a good theologian and preacher; Dr. Thomas Fitzsymons, and the venerable Capuchin, Dr. Nugent, who was living in Spain, giving his preference to the first named. He subscribes himself "your most affec-

⁴ "Memoir of Oliver Plunket," chapter III., pp. 23-24.

tionate cousin." His distinguished relative and correspondent, who was to reflect such lustre on Ireland and its primatial see by his holy life and heroic martyrdom, was the subsequent choice of the Holy See and the personal selection of the Holy Father. No one rejoiced more at this than Archbishop Talbot, who would have proposed him at first, had Dr. Plunket not written to him, stating his desire not to enter for some years on the Irish mission until he had finished some works he was writing.

There were troubled times in Ireland, and still greater troubles ahead, at the time of Dr. Talbot's nomination. He was averse to the publication of the faculty of absolving from the censures fulminated by Rinuccini, fearing it would occasion great disturbance, as there was a rigorous edict of the King against all who would ask for such an absolution, involving incapacity of acquiring property or receiving any inheritance, and exposing the hierarchy to great risk. The question of the validity of the censures was, besides, in dispute. The result of his representations to the Internuncio was that the faculty, though sent to the Bishops, was not published. Dr. Talbot shouldered the burden imposed upon him with a stout heart and a courageous spirit. Writing to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda in May, 1669, he says: "I confess that the burden imposed on me by His Holiness far exceeds my strength, which I know to be slight indeed. But I hope that the Spirit which rules the whole Church, and distributes its graces and gifts according to the exigency of the office which each one discharges, will also grant to me such aid as may enable me to guard from the wolves the flock committed to my charge." The diocese had been deprived of the presence of a Bishop for thirty years. Dr. Fleming, owing to extreme old age, must have been able to afford it little succor during the last seven years of his life, spent in concealment. After a civil war of ten years' duration, Cromwellian devastation and fanaticism, and the legalized spoliation of the Act of Settlement, many tares must have grown up among the wheat, and there must have been many things affecting faith, morals and discipline calling for the exercise of episcopal zeal, energy and activity. A few days before his departure from London, where he had been endeavoring to get Peter Walsh to make his submission to the Holy See, of which he was apparently dubious, he wrote to Monsignor Baldeschi: "In the month of October the Parliament will assemble and we are in dread of persecution if liberty of conscience be not granted." Notwithstanding this foreboding, he crossed over to Ireland, landing at Skerries, on the east coast, in 1669, still hopeful of another restoration, dearer to him than that of the Stuarts, the restoration to its rightful place of the Catholic religion in his native country, for the advancement of which

he was constantly forming designs, laboring for their accomplishment by honorable, peaceful and legitimate means, though his detractors misrepresented him as a man of aspiring and restless spirit involved in political intrigues.

On the 21st of May, 1670, Lord Berkley, of Stratton, was sworn in as Viceroy of Ireland. The appointment filled the Irish Catholics with joy, and all were animated with the hope of a peaceful administration. One of its first fruits was the convocation of a National Council or General Synod of the Irish Bishops, held in Dublin on the 17th of June of that year "in Bridge street, in the house of Mr. Reynolds, at the foot of the bridge," as a note of the archives of Propaganda states. It was convened by Dr. Oliver Plunket, the recently nominated Archbishop of Armagh, for a twofold purpose: first, to correct some abuses which had crept in during the preceding persecutions; and, secondly, to draw up an amended formula of an address of allegiance to the King. At this period the Irish Church numbered but six Bishops in its hierarchy, all of whom, including Archbishop Talbot, took part in the deliberations of the synod. Cardinal Moran, in his "*Memoirs of Oliver Plunket*" (p. 137), corrects a grave error into which many writers have fallen respecting this National Council. "Some writers," he says, "confiding too much on the authority of historians who were alike the enemies of Ireland and of our Catholic faith, have broached assertions regarding this synod which are wholly repugnant to truth, and are alike discreditable to the Archbishop of Dublin and to the subject of these memoirs. Thus, it is gravely asserted that Dr. Talbot, on arriving in Ireland, found the prelates assembled in Dublin—and this, too, in 1669—that he at once introduced himself amongst them, announcing that the King had appointed him to oversee them all; that Dr. Plunket, 'considering this an unwarranted assumption, desired to see the authority on which it was advanced, alleging that if there was in fact such an authority, he would submit to it. The other answered that he had not it under the great seal, to which Dr. Plunket replied that the little seal would serve his turn, but until one or other was produced, he would take care to oversee Talbot and expected to be obeyed.' All these assertions are most unfounded, and are as little consonant to the truth as is the date 1669, which some of these writers assign to the National Synod. It was Dr. Plunket, indeed, that convoked this synod; but Dr. Talbot, who was long in Ireland before the synod, was the chief Bishop with whom he made arrangements for its convocation. The question of the Primacy⁵ being as yet undecided, and the presidency of the synod

⁵ That is the extent of the primatial jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Armagh.

depending on who was to be considered the Primate, Dr. Plunket proposed that the decision of the question should be left to the assembled prelates, but Dr. Talbot chose rather to refer it to the decision of the Holy See, to which the Archbishop of Armagh readily assented, and in the meantime, with the protest which is usually made in such cases, that the rights of the respective parties should receive no prejudice from the order of subscribing to the decrees, etc., the presidency was ceded without any opposition to Dr. Plunket, and the Bishops proceeded with their deliberations in a most perfect spirit of unity and peace.

"It was at the close of the proceedings that a dispute arose which, though of no importance in itself, yet gave some coloring to the fabrication of the above monstrous tale. In the letters of Dr. Plunket no reference is made to this dispute, but in a note of Propaganda it is recorded that on the synod being convened by Dr. Plunket, principally for the purpose of drawing up a declaration of allegiance to His Majesty, and when all the assembled prelates had signed the proposed declaration, a question arose as to who should present it to His Majesty. Some proposed Sir Nicholas Plunket, who had been long distinguished for his services to the Catholic cause, and as well in the deliberations of the Confederation of Kilkenny as in various embassies of which he formed a part had given clear proofs of his ability and prudence. He was a near relative of the Primate and brother of the Bishop of Meath, and in attestation of his services he had received the order of knighthood from Pope Innocent X. Dr. Talbot, however, opposed his appointment to present their address, alleging that he himself had long been intimate with the court and the royal family, and that he had received an authorization from the King to superintend the clergy in civil matters of this kind. Dr. Plunket demanded that this commission from the King should be presented in writing and under the King's seal, adding that then, without hesitation, all would leave in his hands the presentation of the address. Indeed, there can be but little doubt as to Dr. Talbot's having received such a commission from the court, especially as we find a letter addressed to him from London, in September, 1672, by Dr. Patrick Magin, brother of the vicar general of Dromore, conveying to him a similar commission, requesting him, in the name of Lord Arlington, to superintend the manner of acting of the Irish clergy, and to check the violence of some of the prelates. But on the present occasion either Dr. Talbot had not received this commission in writing or was unwilling to present it to the synod, and hence the assembled Bishops deputed Sir Nicholas to be the bearer of their declaration to the King."

A larger and more important question, upon which Dr. Plunket and Dr. Talbot joined issue, was that of the position and prerogatives of the Primacy, such as the right to receive ecclesiastical appeals, make visitations throughout the whole country, and the like. It had been long in dispute, and the Dublin synod of 1670 occasioned the revival of the controversy. It gave birth to a learned discussion, led by Dr. Plunket in 1672 in a work entitled "*Jus Primatiale; or the Ancient Preëminence of the See of Armagh above all other Archbishops in the Kingdom of Ireland,*" which was followed, in 1674, by Dr. Talbot's "*Primatus Dublinensis,*" which put forward "the chief reasons on which the Church of Dublin relies on the possession and prosecution of her right to the Primacy of Ireland"; Dr. Hugh McMahon, Dr. Plunket's successor, in 1728, continuing the discussion in a large quarto volume, "*Jus Primatiale Armacanum,*" in which the right of the Primatial See of Armagh "over all the other Archbishops, Bishops and the entire clergy of Ireland" is asserted. Dr. Talbot took offense at the publication of Dr. Plunket's work, the only one of his which has come down to us, and gave expression to his feelings and opinions in writing to the Secretary of Propaganda. During the heat of controversy a temporary estrangement between the two prelates created an unpleasant situation, which was accentuated by the injudicious interference of lay partisans, and of which the Government took advantage to create dissensions in the Catholic body in furtherance of that insidious policy of *divide et impera* which has always been the motive principle of a Protestant power in its relations with a Catholic nation. It was that which made them favor the Remonstrants, Peter Walsh, as Dr. Talbot, in his "*Friar Disciplined*" (1674), pointed out, being a mere tool and dupe of the Government, used to "divide the Catholics among themselves and discredit their religion," as well as to afford a pretext for subsequent arbitrary measures to penalize them. It was the avowed aim of the crafty Duke of Ormond, as revealed by Carte.⁶ "The more they differ the better," wrote his successor, the Earl of Clarendon, "and it is a pity the contests between them may not be encouraged." As far as dispute regarding the Primacy was concerned, Government was foiled. Through the medium or mediation of Dr. O'Molony, Bishop of Killaloe, a reconciliation was effected between the two Archbishops. "This intelligence," wrote the Internuncio, Monsignor Airoidi, "was the more welcome to me, as it was least expected; indeed, I esteem it rather the work of God than of man." "The reconciliation between me and the Archbishop of Dublin," said Dr. Plunket, "will be uninterrupted, because we will no longer give credence to the sowers of discord. We have agreed to send all our

⁶ Carte II., Appendix 101.

respective arguments to Rome, and we will await its decision." Dr. Talbot wrote in the same strain: "As regards the Archbishop of Armagh, I am his friend, for I attribute whatever he has done to imprudence, rather than to bad intention. I am and ever shall remain his friend, for this conduces to the glory of God and is desired by our friends." They were again of one mind and one heart. "The Archbishop of Dublin and myself are like two real brothers, we agree so well," said Dr. Plunket on another occasion. When a common danger threatened them both, he wrote to Propaganda: "The Parliament of England sought to give annoyance to the Archbishop of Dublin and to me, but through the mercy of God, *laqueus contritus est, et nos liberati sumus.*" In 1671 he interposed his good offices with the Viceroy to have Archbishop Talbot exempted from any penal decree, for, little inclined to favor the Archbishop of Dublin or his family, the Viceroy had resolved to banish him from the kingdom. "I opposed this resolution of the Viceroy with all my power," wrote Dr. Plunket, "humbly supplicating him to desist from it. At the same time I assured him that whatever difference there might be between the Archbishop of Dublin and myself in regard of the question of jurisdiction, yet we were friends; so that His Excellency was appeased, and declared himself edified by my interference in favor of Dr. Talbot."

The danger alluded to was averted for the moment, but not for long. In the beginning of 1672 Dr. Talbot wrote to the Internuncio of Brussels for permission to leave his diocese for awhile. In a letter of March 5 of that year the Papal representative in Belgium announced to Propaganda that Dr. Talbot had been chosen by the court and invited to London for the purpose of being sent to Innsbruck as the King's envoy, and the Internuncio adds that he readily accorded the required permission "as the Archbishop of Armagh and the other prelates of Ireland were of opinion that great advantage would accrue to religion from this mission of Dr. Talbot." His intimacy with the King, when that monarch was in exile, and his high family connections made Dr. Talbot an influential personality. When Lord Berkeley—whom Dr. O'Connor in his "History of the Irish Catholics" praises as a man of probity and moderate principles, who substituted a mild and merciful administration for the unrelenting tyranny and oppression of the penal laws—was sworn in at Dublin Castle as Lord Lieutenant, Archbishop Talbot, on his return from Ghent, where he had sojourned for a short time, immediately on landing waited upon the Viceroy, was courteously received and permitted to appear in his archiepiscopal character before the council, an indulgence without precedent from the time of the Reformation. The relaxation of the penal code permitted the

public exercise of the Catholic religion, and for a brief spell Catholic Ireland enjoyed comparative freedom. Archbishop Talbot availed of it to hold synods, the acts of which are extant; to draw up what Dalton⁷ calls "a manly but moderate assertion of the rights of Catholics," who were emboldened to petition the King for a review of the Act of Settlement, though Ormond prevented either the petitioners or their counsel being heard; and published "A Confutation of the Principles of the Protestant Religion as they are maintained by Dr. Stillingfleet."

But, as always happens in Ireland when any generous concessions are made to the native race or the creed of the majority, they awaken the jealous hostility of the pampered and favored minority and rekindle the smoldering embers of bigotry. The Protestants were, forsooth, indignant because he had the courage to exercise his ministry publicly, a thing unheard of since the Reformation, while some timid Catholics thought he was going too far. But what created the greatest alarm was the power he exercised through his brother, Sir Richard Talbot, over the new deputy. Both parties took up an attitude of hostility towards him. The Protestants charged him with the design of introducing, contrary to law, "Popish" Aldermen into the Dublin Corporation, and reversing the Act of Settlement. They appealed to the English Parliament and presented an address to the King, calling upon him to impose disabilities upon the Catholics. The consequence was a recrudescence of persecution. Thus, in 1672, the liberal and enlightened Lord Berkeley was removed to make room for the bigoted reactionary, Lord Essex. This led at once to a storm of persecution which broke over the heads of the Catholics. Archbishop Talbot was marked out for proscription. Before the end of March, 1674, he was forced to fly, distrusting, as well he might, the mercy or justice of those who should adjudicate in his case; and after some wanderings and concealment, reached Paris. From thence, on May 2, 1674, he issued a pastoral, or rather an address to the Catholics of Ireland, and particularly those of the city and Diocese of Dublin, "On the duty and comfort of suffering subjects," a long homily on patience, fortitude and trust in Providence. It is documentary evidence that he did not, as his detractors would have us believe, sink the prelate in the politician; that the charges of disaffection and turbulence laid to his account were unfounded; that, on the contrary, he used his great authority as a moderating influence, as Irish Bishops have always done, undeterred by the clamor of bigots or the menaces of Ministers, possessing the fullest confidence of the people.

It was at this epoch of his life he published, in reply to Dr.

⁷ "Hist. of the Archbishops of Dublin."

Plunket's "*Jus Primatiale*," a Latin treatise, "*Primatus Dublinensis*," which Ledwick admits exhibits strong good sense and liberality. It is a long forgotten controversy closed by a very wise decision of Rome. No matter how strong were the claims of Armagh in the past to universal jurisdiction, it is obvious that the exercise, even occasionally, of such a jurisdiction, would infringe upon the legitimate freedom and independence of the episcopate. He also published in the same year, and at Paris, "*The History of the Iconoclasts*," "*An Efficacious Remedy Against Atheism and Heresy*," "*The History of Manicheism and Pelagianism*" and "*The Friar Disciplined, or Animadversions on Friar Peter Walsh's New Remonstrant Religion*." In 1675 he ventured into England, taking up his residence at Poole Hall in Cheshire, being then broken down in health and in a precarious condition. The persecution of 1674, which drove the Primate, Dr. Oliver Plunket, and Dr. Brennan, Bishop of Waterford, for refuge into the hills and mountains and woods, wandering about the country in disguise, suffering the greatest hardships and living concealed, was followed in 1678 by another renewal of persecution, another outburst of fanaticism, of which the Titus Oates plot was made the pretext. Ormond, though he did not believe in this bogus plot, was constrained in consequence, through pressure from London, to impose penal disabilities of a very drastic character upon long suffering Catholic Ireland. Archbishop Talbot had meanwhile sought and obtained, through the interest of his brother with the Duke of York, the Viceroy's permission to come to Ireland, "to die," as he said, "in his own country." The feeble prelate was borne in a chair to his brother's house after landing. It was soon after this that Ormond received from the Secretary of State a letter informing him of the "Popish plot" and of the alleged means adopted of extending it to Ireland; adding maliciously that Peter Talbot was one of the accomplices and that assassins had been hired to murder the Viceroy himself! The result was that on October 8, 1678, he signed a warrant for the arrest of the Archbishop of Dublin and dispatched an officer to secure his person. He was arrested, according to Dr. Renehan, at his brother's house at Carton, near Maynooth; while Dalton says it was at Malahide. He was removed to Dublin in a chair and committed a close prisoner to the castle in a miserable and helpless condition, the violence of his malady being hardly endurable, threatening his death at any moment; so much so, that, it being impossible to remove him at once, his transference was postponed for a while, his brother being accepted as security for his appearance. Nothing incriminating was found among his papers to justify the accusation or the

arrest. But that did not save him from a long imprisonment. Dr. Plunket, who was to be a fellow prisoner of his about a year later, wrote on October 27, 1678: "I was quite astonished at the arrest of the Archbishop of Dublin, the more so as since his return to Ireland he did not perform any ecclesiastical function." It was known that Dr. Talbot was suffering from a very painful disease and nearing the close of his life. The malignity of Ormond selected him as the first victim of the revived persecution. The Archbishop of Dublin being imprisoned in Dublin, the other prelates fled to retreats in the woods and morasses, while the flocks were scattered and filled with dismay. The priest-hunters, held in leash like a pack of hounds, were let loose all over the country. A proclamation offered £10 reward for the arrest of a Bishop or Jesuit and £5 for a vicar general or friar. Writing to Propaganda on December 17, 1678, the Internuncio says: "The Archbishop of Dublin still continues in prison; as far as I have been able to learn, none of the other prelates have been as yet apprehended or compelled to leave the Kingdom; but it is certain that they are all retired to places far away from the public, and the most difficult of access, so that they are no longer able to continue their correspondence with me."

Though he was in a dying condition when arrested and lay on what would have been his death-bed, and was almost at the point of death when removed to Dublin Castle, he lingered, in great pain and agony during two years of a weary imprisonment. His last days were, besides, saddened by the news, which reached him from time to time from outside of the persecution prelates, priests and people were undergoing, how his unshepherded flock was left at the mercy of a pitiless Government, a prey to informers and soul-snatchers. In 1680, the Nuncio wrote from Brussels to Rome: "My Lord Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, is dying of his sufferings in the prisons of Ireland." Dr. Oliver Plunket and Dr. Peter Talbot were confined in adjoining rooms, side by side, in the castle. "Before the glorious end of his earthly career in 1680," writes Cardinal Moran, "the Archbishop of Dublin wished to give a final proof to the world that he was moved only by a sense of duty in carrying on this controversy (about the Armagh Primacy) and that notwithstanding their apparent conflict, the fire of charity ever glowed in his courageous soul; and hence, he addressed from his prison chamber, in which he was soon to die, an humble apology to Dr. Plunket, asking his pardon and forgiveness for any fault into which, in the warmth of dispute, he might have fallen. In this holy rivalry of Catholic charity and mutual love Dr. Plunket was not to be overcome, and we learn from a letter

of the Bishop of Kildare.⁸ that when it was reported to him that the Archbishop of Dublin was about to enter on his agony, Dr. Plunket could no longer be restrained, but bursting through his guards, rushed to give a last embrace and absolution to the dying confessor of the Catholic faith."

On March 20, 1917, information was received in Ireland from Rome of the restoration of the name of Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, to the list of Irish martyrs included in the Apostolic process then being held under the supervision of Archbishop Walsh. His name did not appear in the decree of the Congregation of Rites in 1914, but further representations to the Holy See as to his claims to be considered worthy to have his cause tried along with the other 180 servants of God have proved successful. Dr. Renehan, who gives an imperfect list of his writings from Southwell's catalogue, which reaches no further than 1675, comments upon the fact that Dr. Talbot's works are not to be found in any Irish public libraries; a further proof, he says, of the shameful neglect of Irish literary labor, so often complained of that it seems to be the duty of every one to protest against it. Had not Dr. Talbot himself, out of love and respect for the glorious society of which he was once a member, presented copies to their library in Rome, the very titles of most of them would have been lost and the others' names forgotten. They include a treatise "On the Nature of Faith and Heresy" (Antwerp, 1657); "The Catechism of Politicians to Instruct Them in Divine Faith and Moral Virtue" (1658); "On the Nullity of the Anglican Protestant Church" (Brussels, 1658); a "Treatise on Religion and Government" (Ghent, 1670); a "History of the Iconoclasts" (Paris, 1674), etc.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

⁸ Dr. Forstall's letter was dated June 5, 1680. In it he says: "Miserimus Dublinensis cerebro totoque corpore ægrotans plurimum, vix ultima die veneris sanctissimam non efflavit animam. Primate strenue perumpente inter reluctantes satellites ut sum solaretur et absolveret."

IRISH SAINTS HONORED IN SCOTLAND.

IN an article entitled "The Saints of Catholic Scotland," which appeared in a former issue of this REVIEW (July, 1918), it was stated as unquestionable that the majority of those holy ones of bygone centuries whose names were held in reverence as saints of God in the kingdom of Scotland were actually denizens of Ireland. The circumstances which led to such a result may be thus summarized:

1. The large monastery, founded at Whithorn by St. Ninian, on the model of the celebrated Marmoutier of his kinsman, St. Martin, and popularly styled *Magnum Monasterium*, attracted crowds of eager students from Ireland. Thither—besides numerous pilgrims of less distinction—came the renowned St. Finnian of Moville, to study the Sacred Scriptures and to drink in the principles of true monasticism, for the benefit later on of his own country. Thither, too, as tradition affirms, came the illustrious St. Patrick himself, to visit in loving veneration St. Ninian, the helper of the earliest missionaries to Ireland, and his senior by some forty years. For the fishermen of Port Patrick, from the testimony of a priest living there a century ago, were accustomed to point out a certain spar of rock there as the spot where St. Patrick tied up the boat on which he crossed over frequently from the Irish shore.¹

2. That district of Strathclyde, moreover, where the "Great Monastery" was situated, gained distinction from the fact that it was the traditional birthplace of St. Patrick. "For more than a thousand years," Cardinal Moran asserts, "it was the uninterrupted tradition of Ireland and Scotland that our apostle, St. Patrick, was born in the valley of the Clyde." Although, as he goes on to remark, this opinion was rejected by learned historians of the nineteenth century, many documents which had come to light since then had served to confirm what he styles "the more venerable" tradition, and that to which he himself had always adhered.²

3. Three Irish chieftains, sons of Erc, and named respectively Fergus Mor, Lorn and Angus, left the district of Dalriada, in Ulster, early in the sixth century, and with their followers settled on the opposite coast of what is now called Scotland. There, north of the Clyde, and westward from the mountain range of Drumalban, in the district now known as Argyle, they founded a little kingdom, which they named after their homeland, Dalriada.³ Small in its beginnings, the kingdom increased in extent and power during the

¹ Moran, "Irish Saints in Great Britain," p. 152.

² Moran, "Irish Saints in Great Britain," p. 144.

³ Hunter-Blair, "Hist. of Catholic Church of Scotland," vol I., p. 128.

following centuries, until in the eleventh century the name of Scotia—properly belonging to Ireland, the land of the Scots—was extended to the country which was embraced by the Dalriadan rule on the opposite coast, and eventually to the whole of Caledonia or North Britain. The first settlers in Scottish Dalriada were Christians, who had been blessed by St. Patrick in person, and they formed the nucleus from which faith was to spread later in that part of the country.

From these facts we are able to estimate the close connection which sprang up between the two countries, and especially the surpassing interest felt in the spread of Christianity among the pagan peoples of the north by their Irish neighbors. In Strathclyde—St. Patrick's birthplace—was the further attraction of the "Great Monastery" of St. Ninian, to whom Irish Christians looked for the attainment of sanctity and learning; in Dalriada their own countryfolk had settled, and their boundaries were growing ever wider—stretching on the one hand to the islands of the west and on the other towards the territories of the partly converted Southern Picts beyond the mountains, while to the north lay the vast pagan lands inhabited by Northern Picts. Add to this the fact that as early as the end of the century which saw the death of St. Ninian, hundreds of former converts in Strathclyde and among the Southern Picts—dwelling between the Firth of Forth and the Grampians—had relapsed into paganism. The missionary zeal of the Irish was stirred on behalf of peoples whose destitute condition seemed to cry out: "Come over * * * and help us!" And to that appeal they gave a generous answer.

It was to Scottish Dalriada, as was natural, that the first Irish missionaries seem to have come. Among the first of these, if we are to accept the opinion which places his death in 507, was St. Modan. He was certainly one of the most celebrated; traces of his labors are to be found all along the west coast of Scotland. Many places still bear his name, although his life and labors have been forgotten by those who inhabit them. He was the son of an Irish chieftain, and became a monk early in life. All that is known of his after career is gathered from the many dedications in his honor in the districts where he preached. His first oratory was at Balmodhan ("St. Modan's Dwelling"), a short distance from the later priory of Ardochattan, near Loch Etive; St. Modan's Well is still pointed out. The site is one of great beauty and charm. Another ancient church of which he is patron is that of Rosneath, in Dumbartonshire. Its name signifies the "Promontory of the Sanctuary." It was here that he was laid to rest, and his tomb was the bourne of a favorite pilgrimage. Kilmodan, on the Kyles of Bute, and another church

in Argyleshire were also under his patronage.⁴ Scott testifies to the popular devotion shown to this saint in his "Lay of the Last Minstrel":

"Then each to each his troubled breast,
To some blest saint his prayers addressed—
Some to Saint Modan made their vows,
Some to Saint Mary of the Lowes."⁵

As in the case of saints of Scottish origin, it is necessary for brevity's sake to restrict our view to the chief figures of each century. To touch upon all would demand a volume rather than a few pages. We pass on, therefore, to a prominent saint of the same sixth century, St. Medan (also called Modwenna), an Irish nun who took part in the spread of religion in Scotland by the foundation of as many as six or more churches and monasteries for women. She had received the habit of a nun from St. Patrick himself, and was the dear friend of another of his disciples, the renowned St. Brigid. Medan was born in the district of Conaille, and after spending some years as a recluse in her own land, passed over to Scotland. The chief of her foundations was in Galloway, in the parish known by her name in the corrupted form of Kirkmaiden; her cave chapel is still existing close to the Mull of Galloway, near to the site of the ancient church, which, dedicated to the saint—as were also at least three other parish churches in the same county—gave the place its designation.⁶ Other churches were founded by St. Medan in Strathclyde; recent antiquarian discoveries on the top of Trapain Law, East Lothian, are considered by competent judges to have brought to light the remains of one of these. An ancient life of the saint says that one of her churches was situated on Mons Dunpeleder—a corruption of Dunpender, the original Celtic name of the hill in question. But still more interesting is the fact that a similar discovery made in 1918 under the chapel in Edinburgh Castle known as St. Margaret's, has led to the conjecture that another of St. Medan's foundations—that of Edinburgh—must have existed in that spot. If so, it is a striking corroboration of the opinion of the learned Dr. Skene, a former Historiographer Royal of Scotland, that the terms "Maiden Castle" and "Edinburgh" referred to this saint. Her name Medan, or Medana, is formed from Mo-Edana, after a common practice with regard to Celtic names, as will be seen more than once in this article.

⁴ Moran, "Irish Saints," etc., p. 184.

⁵ Scott, "Lay of Last Minstrel," Canto vi.

⁶ Moran, "Irish Saints," etc., p. 153.

"Medan's Castle" and "Edana's Burgh," in such cases, have suffered little change in course of time.

St. Medan is said to have died in extreme old age at Longfordan, near Dundee, after a most penitential life, during which she made at least one pilgrimage on foot to Rome. In addition to her ancient dedications and her holy well at Kirkmaiden, the saint's name has been perpetuated in the modern Catholic church at Troon, called SS. Mary and Medan; it stands appropriately in Meddan (or Medan) street in that Ayrshire town.

St. Brendan was another very popular saint in the western parts of Scotland. After missionary labors in Wales and the foundation of many monasteries in his native country, where he is said to have ruled over as many as 3,000 monks, he journeyed to Scotland. The exact sites of the two monasteries he founded there cannot be accurately designated: three in the Hebrides and the Island of Bute are conjectural localities. The many dedications of churches in his honor witness to the devotion shown to the saint, whether or not they were in some instances founded by him. They are Kilbrannan, in Mull; Kilbrandon, in the island of Seil; Boyndie, in Banffshire; Birnie, in Moray; Kilbirnie, in Ayrshire, and a ruined chapel on St. Kilda. The fishermen of the Western Isles perpetuated until almost recent times an ancient appeal to the saint for a favorable wind. Though ignorant of the significance of the invocation, they would cry repeatedly: "*Brainuilt, Brainuilt!*"—a contraction, it is supposed, of the Gaelic equivalent for "Brendan the Voyager!" The title refers to the tradition perpetuated by narratives—probably dating long after the saint's time—of his wonderful missionary voyages to regions hitherto unknown to mariners. Much in these stories is undoubtedly fabulous, but it is undeniable that the saint's journeying was extensive. Some writers have maintained that he actually touched the American shore. However this may be, there can be little doubt that the tradition—familiar in every European country—of St. Brendan's wonderful discoveries of vast countries in the west hitherto unexplored, kept in mind the possibility of lands existing beyond the western seas and led eventually to the discovery of the great American continent. The feast of St. Brendan, on May 16, has been restored to the Scottish calendar. He died in 577.⁷

Considerations of space urge the passing over of such names as St. Blane, whose church at Dunblane became one of the Scottish Cathedrals; of St. Finbar, of Cork, missionary to Kintyre, whose memory lives in the designation of the island of Barra and in other place-names; of St. Finan the Leper, patron of Glenfinnan, in Argyle-

⁷ Barrett, "Calendar of Scott. Saints," p. 76.

shire, where his ancient bronze bell is still treasured, and of others of like renown. The prominent figure among the Irish missionaries of the century is the great Columcille, or, to give him his more customary title, St. Columba. It is impossible to pass by this world-wide saint without a few words of appreciation; yet to treat adequately his wondrous life with its labors, penances and miracles, is out of the question here.

The apostle of the northern regions of Scotland was born of kingly race in 521. He gave himself in his early youth to God's service, and at twenty-five years of age founded his first monastery at Derry—the precursor of the hundred houses of God which Ireland was to owe to his unremitting zeal. As a proof of his boundless energy in the work of transcription which formed the chief labor of his monks, it is said that he actually wrote out with his own hands 300 manuscripts of the Psalter and the Gospels. In his forty-second year Columba was inspired with the resolution of carrying into effect a long-cherished project of leaving his beloved land to carry the Gospel to the pagans of Caledonia. On Whitsunday, 563, after a brief examination of the island of Oransay, he landed with twelve companions on Iona, destined to become the centre of their marvelously successful labors. When on June 9, 597, St. Columba was called to his reward in heaven, after thirty-four years of unremitting effort, his missionaries had carried the faith beyond the Grampians and even to Shetland and Orkney, while churches and schools of sanctity and learning had been founded on all sides, both on the mainland and adjacent islands. The traces of the cult paid to this saint in the shape of dedications, place-names, holy wells, fairs and the like, are too numerous to recount. St. Columba is credited with having founded no less than fifty churches in Scotland.⁸

The work of evangelizing the north was continued with no less zeal by St. Columba's disciples. Two of them deserve special notice. St. Machar, called also Mochonna, son of a chieftain of Ulster, was one of the twelve first companions of the great missionary. After being consecrated Bishop he was sent to Strathdon with twelve others, to preach the Gospel there. Tradition says that St. Columba commanded Machar to settle at a spot near the river Don, where the shape of a Bishop's pastoral staff was formed by its windings, and that this led him to fix his see at Aberdeen. The old Cathedral there bears his name, as also two parishes in the county. His holy well was venerated near the Cathedral. St. Machar's feast falls on November 12 and was restored to the calendar by Leo XIII. in 1898.⁹

St. Drostan, the other disciple alluded to, lived beyond the end of

⁸ Adamnan, "Life of St. Columba" (Reeves), *passim*.

⁹ Forbes, "Kalendars" (St. Machar.)

the sixth century, and his name is in still greater estimation. He is said by some writers to have been born in Scotland of the race of kings of Dalriada. He became a monk at Iona, and was chosen by St. Columba to evangelize the district of Buchan in Aberdeenshire. In reward for the restoration to life at the prayer of Columba of the son of a Pictish chief, land was given for the establishment of a monastery on the bank of the river Ugie, about twelve miles inland from the Moray Firth. Drostan was left in charge, and his sorrow at parting with his master led to the place being called Deer. The Celtic legend embodied in the "Book of Deer," the oldest Scottish MS. extant, preserved at Cambridge University, thus relates the circumstance:

"Drostan's tears (*deara*) came on parting with Columcille. Said Columcille, 'Let Dear be its name henceforward.'"¹⁰

The saint ended his days at Deer, and according to the Aberdeen Breviary, was laid to rest in a stone tomb at Aberdour, "where many sick persons," it affirms, "find relief." Before entering Iona, St. Drostan seems to have labored as a missionary in Inverness-shire. The beautiful and fertile valley known as Glenurquhart, opening out from Loch Ness, about twelve miles from Inverness, is associated with him. A small piece of land there is still called in Gaelic "St. Drostan's Croft," and the glen was formerly styled *Urchudainn mo Dhrostaín*—"St. Drostan's Urquhart"—to distinguish it from other localities bearing the same name. There are numerous dedications to St. Drostan in Scotland. The churches of Aberdour and Old Deer in Aberdeenshire; Glenesk, Edzell and Lochlee, in Forfarshire; Rothiemay, Banffshire; Alvie and Urquhart, Inverness-shire; Halkirk and Cannisbay, in Caithness, are some of them. No less than five holy wells in the adjacent counties of Aberdeen and Forfar bear his name.¹¹

St. Moluag, a contemporary of St. Columba, was a monk of Bangor who passed over to Scotland to work for souls. He took up his abode on the island of Lismore, in Argyleshire, and converted many to the faith. He founded churches and monasteries in other localities also, especially in Ross-shire. St. Moluag's name is an example of a custom alluded to above, of the addition of the prefix *Mo* to the actual designation of a person. His real name was *Lugaidh* (pronounced and sometimes written *Lua*); its Latin form is *Luanus*. *Mo* in Gaelic is a title of honor, and *ag* an endearing suffix; thus Moluag may be translated literally, "My own dear (little) Lugaidh." *Kilmalomaig*, an ancient burying ground near Fort Augustus, and reserved to Catholics long after the Reforma-

¹⁰ "Book of Deer" (Spalding Club), p. 92.

¹¹ Barrett, "Calendar of Scott. SS.," p. 100.

tion, is named after this saint. St. Bernard, in his life of St. Malachy, relates of St. Moluag: "One of the sons of that sacred family (Bangor), Lua by name, is said himself alone to have been the founder of a hundred monasteries"—this refers, of course, to Ireland. St. Moluag died in 592.¹²

Lismore became eventually the seat of the Bishopric of Argyle, and the ruins of the ancient Cathedral—said to be the smallest in Britain, though possibly much of the fabric has entirely disappeared—may still be seen. It bore the saint's name, as did also many churches in the Western Isles and some others on the mainland. The pastoral staff of St. Moluag is in possession of the Argyle family.¹³ His ancient bell was lost at the time of the Reformation. Great devotion was shown to this saint both in Scotland and Ireland. He is styled in the "Felire of Aengus":

"Luoc the pure, the brilliant, the Sun of Lismore in Alba."

St. Donnan, another contemporary of St. Columba, was an Irish monk who journeyed with fifty-two companions to the Island of Eigg, in the Hebrides. While the saint was saying Mass, the pagans broke in upon them. Respite was asked until Mass was ended, when all were slain. The massacre was ordered by a female proprietor of the island, styled in ancient chronicles the Queen. The saint and his companions were reckoned martyrs, and many churches built in their honor in the Western Isles. The feast of St. Donnan and his companions has been restored to Scotland, and is kept on April 17—the date on which Sunday fell in the year of their martyrdom, 617.¹⁴

Mention has been made already of St. Finian, the founder of the celebrated monastery of Moville, in County Down, as having studied at *Candida Casa*, St. Ninian's "Great Monastery" at Whithorn. It was at Moville that many notable Irish saints and scholars were trained—St. Columba being one of them. St. Finian's part in the evangelization of Scotland must not be overlooked. The Scottish tradition speaks of his having settled in Ayrshire with a few companions and established monastic life in the Cunningham district; the abbey of Kilwinning, where Benedictines were established in a later age, is called after him, for its name signifies "Church of Wynnin." The varying forms in which his name appears are to be accounted for by the character of the different languages used. There is a still more startling change of this kind in connection with the same saint. After a pilgrimage to Rome, whence he returned to

¹² Barrett, "Calendar of Scott. SS.," p. 93.

¹³ Hunter-Blair, "Hist. of Cath. Ch. of Scot.," vol. II., p. 367.

¹⁴ Moran, "Irish SS.," p. 87.

his own land with a treasure—precious in those early days—under the form of a manuscript copy of the Sacred Scriptures, Finian traveled to Italy a second time. Staying for a time in the city of Lucca, when that see was vacant, the people became so struck with his holiness that they procured his consecration as their Bishop. His life and miracles in that place form the subject of a portion of the “Dialogues” of St. Gregory the Great. In Italy this saint is known under the designation of Frigidian. He died in 572.¹⁵

Another missionary of that epoch was St. Mirin, who preached the faith at Paisley, where his tomb became the bourne of many pilgrims. His name was perpetuated in the dedication of the important abbey of Cluniac Benedictines, founded there in a later age. There are many traces of other dedications to this saint and of holy wells called after him. The seal of the abbey bore his image with the inscription: “O Mirin, pray to Christ for thy servants!” Lights were kept burning round his tomb for centuries, and a small chapel of great beauty, built in the late fifteenth century by a devout citizen and his wife, in honor of St. Mirin and St. Columba, is still to be seen annexed to the ruins of the ancient choir of the abbey. It is used as a mortuary chapel by the Abercorn family, who came into possession of the monastic property.¹⁶

A female saint who inspired great devotion in Scotland was the virgin Triduanna. She lived as a solitary at Rescobie, in Forfarshire, about the seventh century. Of her a popular legend related that when a prince of that country conceived an unlawful passion for her and pursued her with his unwelcome attentions, Triduanna plucked out her beautiful eyes—her chief attraction—and sent them to him. In reward she obtained the power of curing diseases of the sight. She died at Restalrig (anciently written Lestalrig), a village about two miles from Edinburgh. Her tomb became a popular place of pilgrimage from all parts of Scotland, and was the most important shrine in that part of the country. Her holy well there was frequented by those who suffered from any affection of the eye. Sir David Lyndsay, the satirical poet of the Reformation, ridicules the superstition of those who resorted to “St. Trid Well” “to mend their ene.” On account of the popularity of this church, and the fact that Dean Sinclair, the superior of the collegiate body established there, was one of the most prominent opponents of the Reformation, the building was ordered by the General Assembly of the Kirk in the first year of the supremacy of the Reformers (1560), “to be razed and utterly cast down as a monument of idolatry.”

¹⁵ Moran, “Irish SS.,” p. 192.

¹⁶ Barrett, “Calendar Scott. SS.,” p. 123.

This was so completely done that only fragments were allowed to remain.

In 1907, after the building had served for some seventy years (by means of partial restoration) as a chapel of ease to the parish church of South Leith, a scheme was set on foot to restore a small six-sided building hard by, which went by the name of "Chapter House," but which had become entirely filled with earth and rubbish with trees growing out of it. Wonderful to relate, this was found to be a beautiful Gothic building which had once stood over a well of water, to which steps led down. There could be no doubt in the minds of antiquarians that this had been the famous "Trid Well" of pre-Reformation fame. The building has been put into complete repair. The saint's name is met with in many different parts of Scotland, but in some cases it has undergone such changes as to render it almost unrecognizable. It occurs under the forms of Tredwell, Tradwell, Traddles, Trallew, Trallen, etc., and is found as far north as the Orkney Islands.¹⁷

It may be noticed here that legends speak of the coming of St. Brigid to Scotland in an earlier century; there was certainly a widespread devotion to her, and one of her disciples founded a monastery for women at Abernethy, to which it is possible she may have come. The sacred songs of the Western Islanders are filled with the praises of Brigid, Patrick and Columba. Many churches, too, bear St. Brigid's name.

Other Irish female recluses visited Scotland. Among these were St. Kentigerna, daughter of one Irish prince and wife of another, who took up her abode on an island in Loch Lomond, after her husband's death. The island acquired the name of *Innis na Caillich* ("The Nun's Island"), and is still so called. The old parish church of Buchanan, built there, was dedicated to her. It is now in ruins. St. Kentigerna died in 733. A century later two other holy women from Ireland came over to Scotland to live a more hidden life and to pray for the people of the country. One of these emigrants was St. Baya (or Vey), a virgin recluse who lived in solitude on the island of Little Cumbrae, in the Firth of Clyde, where ruins of her chapel are to be seen. St. Maura, another Irish virgin, who governed a community of nuns on the mainland, used to visit her friend Vey for spiritual converse from time to time. She died at Kilmaurs ("Church of Maura") in Ayrshire. These two saints flourished in the ninth century.¹⁸

With St. Kentigerna came her young son Foelan, both being in

¹⁷ Barrett, "Calendar Scott. SS.," p. 134. Barrett, "Footprints of Ancient Church of Scotland," p. 117.

¹⁸ Barrett, "Calend. of SS.," pp. 6, 145.

charge of her brother, Comgan. The latter was prince of his province in Ireland, but had to fly for his life on account of opposition to his Christian rule, and took with him for safety his sister and her son. St. Comgan lived in great austerity in Lochalsh, Argyleshire, and died at an advanced age. There were many dedications in his honor in different parts of the country. One of the most important was Turriff, in Aberdeenshire, where a collegiate church was founded in the thirteenth century for the benefit of thirteen poor men who were maintained there. It was known as St. Comgan's Hospital.¹⁹

St. Foelan (or Fillan) spent some years with his uncle at Lochalsh, but the scene of his labors was Perthshire, where Strathfillan is called after him. Near Houston in that district are the ruins of an old church which bore his name, a stone hard by is called Fillan's Seat, and a holy well once existed there, until a parish minister of the eighteenth century caused it to be filled up as a remnant of superstition. A fair was formerly held there also on the saint's feast day. In Strathfillan are the ruins of another ancient chapel, close to the Holy Pool of St. Fillan, whose waters in Catholic ages were believed to have power in curing the insane. Even now it is much frequented—chiefly by Protestants—for the cure of various maladies; about a century ago a visitor relates that he saw hundreds of persons bathe in the water: the stones at the side were covered with gloves, handkerchiefs and bandages—a relic of Catholic practice in bygone days. Near Struan Church, in the same county, another well of this saint was once greatly esteemed as miraculous; St. Fillan's fair was held there annually on his feast, January 9, and continued after the Reformation.²⁰

There are two notable relics of St. Fillan still in existence. His crozier is in the National Museum, Edinburgh; his bell, once kept near his holy pool, was carried off to England by a visitor more than a century ago, but was restored to Scotland later, and is now preserved in the museum of the Antiquarian Society in Edinburgh.²¹ The relic of the arm of the saint is said to have been instrumental in gaining for Robert the Bruce the victory of Bannockburn. The custodian had feared to risk the loss of the relic, and had brought to the battlefield the empty case only, but on opening the latter before the battle, the relic was found within it; the miracle is said by the chronicler, Boece, to have given such valor and confidence to the army that their success was the result. The saint's feast was restored to Scotland by Leo XIII.²²

¹⁹ Barrett, "Calend. of SS.," p. 136.

²⁰ Moran, "Irish SS.," etc., p. 206.

²¹ "Proceedings Soc. Antiquar. of Scot.," vol. VIII., (1870).

²² Barrett, "Calendar Scot. SS.," p. 19.

St. Adamnan, abbot of Iona, is famous for his *Vita S. Columbae*, styled by a Protestant writer of repute "the most complete piece of such biography that all Europe can boast of, not only at so early a period, but even through the whole Middle Ages."²³ He was born in Ireland about 626, and belonged to the family of St. Columba. At the age of thirty-five he entered the monastery of Iona, and was raised to the abbacy about twenty years later. For learning and literary ability he ranks very high among ecclesiastics of his time, being well versed in Scripture and acquainted with both Hebrew and Greek; he is extolled for his holy and penitential life by St. Bede, Alcuin and many other of his biographers. Devotion to this saint is evidenced by the many churches dedicated to him, and the place-names still in use. His chief churches were Aboyne and Forvie (Aberdeenshire), Forglen (Banffshire), Kileunan (Argyleshire), Dull, Blair-Athole and Grantully (Perthshire), Kinneff (Kincardineshire), and Abriachan (Inverness-shire). Many holy wells bore his name, and fairs were held on his feast day in some places. The name of Adamnan has passed into various forms in different localities; it has been corrupted to Aunan, Arnty, Eunan, Ounan, Teunan ("Saint-Eunan"), Skeulan, Arnold, Eonan and Ewen—the latter being a favorite Christian name in the Highlands. St. Adamnan's feast falls on September 23.²⁴

In the same eighth century flourished St. Maelrubha,²⁵ another Irish saint, very popular in Scotland. He passed over from Ireland in his thirtieth year and founded at Applecross, in Ross-shire, a monastery which eventually rivaled the Irish Bangor where he had been trained; over it he ruled as abbot for more than fifty years. Throughout the whole of the west of Scotland and the adjacent islands he acquired a widespread reputation for sanctity. Scottish tradition has ranked him with the martyrs, as having been slain by pagan Norsemen, but in this the Irish records do not concur. Antiquarians have maintained that with the exception of St. Columba, no saint had more churches dedicated in his honor in the western districts of Scotland than St. Maelrubha. As in the case of St. Adamnan, this saint also is known under the most varied appellations—Malruf, Molroy, Mury, Maree, Errew, Olrou and the like. At many places fairs were held on his feast: at least twenty-one churches are enumerated as bearing his name—many of them, formerly considered as dedicated to St. Mary, are now held by historians as having St. Maree for titular.

Loch Maree, a beautiful fresh-water lake in Ross-shire, renowned

²³ Pinkerton, "Enquiry," pref. vol. I, p. 48.

²⁴ Barrett, "Calend. Scott. SS.," p. 127.

²⁵ Moran, "Irish SS.," etc., p. 203.

for its magnificent scenery, is the most interesting locality connected with this saint. One of its many islands contains the remains of an ancient chapel and burying ground; a deep well near it was famed for the efficacy of its water in curing lunacy. The feast of St. Maelrubha falls on August 27; it was restored to the Scottish calendar by Leo XIII.

St. Adrian and his companion martyrs belong to a later century. An old legend, now held as unauthentic, made him a native of Hungary, who journeyed to Scotland with several companions to preach the faith there. It has been demonstrated by modern antiquarians that this saint is identical with Odhran, an Irish missionary, who took up his abode with several companions on the Isle of May, in the Firth of Forth, and there founded a monastery, which became in later ages a famous place of pilgrimage, after he and his monks had been martyred by the Danes.²⁶ A Benedictine priory, under the jurisdiction of Reading abbey, in Berkshire, was established there by King David I. in the twelfth century; it was later transferred to the Austin Canons. St. Monan, one of the martyrs, who had preached the Gospel in Fifeshire, became patron of Abercrombie, in that county; the town became known as St. Monance, on account of the translation thither of the saint's relics, but is now generally called by its former title. St. Adrian and his companions were put to death about the year 875.

St. Geradin (or Gervadius) was an Irish hermit who took up his abode in the province of Moray in the latter half of the ninth century. The site of his cave was long pointed out at Lossimouth, now an attractive little watering place about five miles from Elgin. For many centuries this habitation was left intact; an ancient Gothic doorway and small window were built into the face of the rock, which acquired the name of "Holy Man's Head." More than a hundred years ago the stonework was demolished by a drunken sailor, and eventually the whole rock, with the sacred spring known as Gerardin's Well, was scooped out by stone quarriers. No trace is left of it. The saint had an oratory at Kinnedar also; the spot is now identified with the churchyard of Drainie, the parish in which Lossiemouth is situated.²⁷

Tradition tells that the saint was accustomed on stormy nights to wave a lantern to and fro, in order to warn passing vessels of the proximity of dangerous rocks. It is interesting to find this tradition perpetuated in the armorial bearings of the modern burgh of Lossiemouth: St. Gerardin, lantern in hand, is there portrayed, and above him runs the motto: *Per noctem lux*. A recently built Presbyterian

²⁶ Moran, "Irish SS.," etc., p. 217.

²⁷ Barrett, "Calend. Scott. SS.," p. 147.

church there has been named—contrary to the usual custom—after this local saint. St. Gerardin died in 934.

Many illustrious examples might be added to the above: the great Bishops Aidan, Finan, Colman, Malachy—all prominent in the history of their times—as well as others less known, such as SS. Boniface, Ronan, Voloc, Marnock, etc.; the abbots Regulus, Canice, Kieran, Kevin, Cumine, Baitan and the martyred Blaithmaic; the hermits Fiacre, Molios, Ethernasc, Fechin, Mahew, Fillan the Leper and others; these with many more took part in the evangelization of Scotland by prayer, preaching, and—more powerful than all else—the virtues of a saintly life.

Enough has been said to show the immensity of Scotland's spiritual debt to the Island of Saints, and her acknowledgment of it by the loving reverence paid throughout the ages of faith to those holy sons and daughters of Ireland. May that devotion revive and increase in our own generation; then we may surely hope to experience the effects of the powerful intercession of the saints in the restoration of the faith of old to the people of Scotland.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus Abbey, Scotland.

Book Reviews.

"Convent Life: The Meaning of a Religious Vocation." By Martin J. Scott, S. J., author of "God and Myself," etc. 12 mo., pp. 315. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

How often do we not hear persons, inside the Church as well as outside, ask questions concerning religious, their vocation, their novitiate, their life, their discipline, their joys and their sorrows, which perhaps we cannot answer at all, or answer in a satisfactory manner? How often do we not hear those who are in doubt about their vocation ask such questions? How often do we not hear the enemies of the Church make attacks on convents and their inmates which perhaps we cannot repel in an effective manner? It is to answer all these needs that Father Scott has written the book which we find before us, and which explains the religious life in a most charming manner. If we make a running summary of its contents, we shall be able in a most attractive way to bring before our readers its many excellent qualities and its fund of information.

In the United States there are at present about a hundred thousand women who have consecrated their lives to religion as Sisters. That is a considerable army, the Red Cross of Christ. Every year thousands of young ladies enroll themselves under the standard of the religious life. Many people must, therefore, be interested in the sort of life to which the Sister dedicates herself. The present volume aims at putting the religious vocation before the public. Most Catholics understand what the career of a Sister implies, but, nevertheless, desire to know a little more about it. Non-Catholics are interested to know what it is that attracts the choicest souls, year after year, to the sacrifice of all that people value most highly. The word "convent" means an assembly, a coming together. In the ecclesiastical sense it means an assemblage of persons dwelling together in a religious house, to acquire perfection by means of the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience under the authority of a religious superior. The establishment of a convent requires either episcopal or Papal authorization.

The words "convent" and "monastery," although originally quite different in meaning, are now employed to express much the same thing. Generally, however, a convent refers to a religious establishment of women, while a monastery usually, but not always, indicates a place for men. The words "nun" and "Sister" are now employed by people generally without any difference of meaning, although ecclesiastically they are quite distinct. This being a treatise for general readers, the terms "nun" and "Sister" will be employed in their popular sense.

Convents are cloistered, and may be either enclosed or unenclosed. The enclosed convents are those whose members are absolutely closed off from the outside world. The enclosed Sisters never leave the convent. Sisters of the unenclosed convents go in and out as their duties require. Those who live in convents are called religious or a religious community. As applied to nuns and Sisters, this term means that their lives are devoted exclusively to the service of religion. Religious are said to lead an active or a contemplative life, according as their special manner of living is devoted mostly to external works of mercy or to prayer. In former times, when Christian civilization was in formation and society was crude and vicious, the contemplative life dominated. Pious souls who wished to escape from the contagion of evil withdrew to the cloister as a place of security and prayer, to do penance for the sins of the world. Later on, when woman's place in the world was made more secure, devout souls entered the convent as a place to sanctify themselves, in order to issue forth and do service to their fellow-men for the love of Christ.

This service consisted in what is called nowadays social service. Whatever a woman can do to give a helping hand to one in need, that is the work of a Sister. It may be rescue work among the fallen or unfortunate, or helping the poor or nursing in hospitals and poor homes, or caring for orphans and the aged and the blind and the outcast. In times of war, the battlefield is their convent. Hence they are known as Angels of the Battlefield and Angels of Mercy. All this we shall dwell on later in our chapters on the Red Cross Sisterhoods and the social service Sisterhoods. For the Red Cross, which is now the badge of mercy the world over, was the special insignia of the religious Orders of Mercy as far back as the twelfth century.

Besides the Sisterhoods which devote themselves to contemplation and those that give themselves to works of mercy, there are the orders wherein the members exercise the duties of both the active and the contemplative life. In the contemplative orders one of the essential duties is the recitation of the Divine Office in choir. Besides that duty they have many others. Some active orders have choir duty also. These Sisterhoods, by thus combining some of the main features of the contemplative orders with the duties of the active orders, are what is called religious of mixed life. In modern times most of the religious orders belong to this last class.

In both the enclosed and unenclosed communities there are lay Sisters, that is, Sisters who are not obliged to do choir duty. There are many religious souls who have not the education required to fulfill the duties of choir Sisters, but who, nevertheless, yearn for a

life of service and sanctity apart from the hindrance of the world. For such the lay Sisterhood is open.

Before a convent is established, the permission of the Bishop of the place is required. Except those convents which are immediately under Papal authority, all convents are subject to episcopal jurisdiction. The Bishop or his delegate may inspect them at any time, and all the nuns may have recourse to him whenever they see fit.

Everything in regard to convent life aims at giving the Sisters the latitude of the children of God. As we shall see in the body of this work, the fullest freedom is given the young woman who contemplates being a Sister. None but those who have applied for admission as a Sister can realize how difficult it is to be received. This will be shown in detail further on.

After admission they are called postulants, that is, they postulate or request to be admitted permanently. As postulants they live the life of the Sisters and see it in all its phases. During this time of postulancy, which lasts from six months to a year, they may leave any time without any formality.

After being postulants, they are received as novices into the community. This means that they enter more intimately into the life of the Sisters, but are not yet received as such. The novitiate, as this period is called, lasts usually a year. During this period the novice may leave at any time without any formality whatsoever.

After the novitiate, they are permitted to take the religious vows for a specified time. Only after three years are they allowed to bind themselves permanently to the obligations of the religious life.

On a certain occasion a non-Catholic was heard to remark: "Where in the world do all the Sisters come from?" Not only to those outside the Church does this question suggest itself, but also to Catholics themselves. You see the Sisters everywhere. They are caring for the old in homes for the aged, and watching over infants in foundling asylums. You will find them nursing the sick in hospitals and binding up the wounds of soldiers on the battlefields. In schools and academies they are engaged in the education of youth, and in distant lands they help the missionaries to civilize the savage. Others devote their lives to the adoration of God in the Blessed Sacrament, to prayer, contemplation and charity. Some give their lives to penance and reparation for the sins of the world, which else might call God's wrath upon mankind. Then there are those angels of restoration who seek the sheep that have strayed to bring them back into the fold, as did the Good Shepherd Himself in His days among men. And where do they all come from? From everywhere and from every class and condition of society. In the convent you will find those who were rich and those who were poor, the educated

and the simple, the aristocrat and the humble. That is what they were before entering; once in the convent, they are all Sisters, they form one family in Jesus Christ, they have all things in common, for which reason they are called a community.

Now there are certain souls who are drawn to Christ by the great love He has shown them. He became a little child for them, lived, suffered and died for them. If there were no heaven or no hell, they would love Him and serve Him in return for His love. They would delight to serve Him personally if He were on earth, as the holy women in the Gospel did, but that they cannot do.

However, they realize, from His own words, that service done to others for His sake is taken by Him as done to Himself, so they burn with a desire to work for and with Christ. By helping others, they are doing something unto Christ Himself. By prayer, adoration and penance, they are working with Him in saving the souls of men. By teaching, they are instructing little ones in the ways of the kingdom of God and enlarging that kingdom which He established on earth.

To work for and with Jesus Christ! That is the noblest motive for entering the convent, and it is the motive which actuates most of those who become Sisters. The personal love of Christ! Love for Christ stronger than human love; love of Christ so strong that it has made the young, the beautiful, the rich, prefer it to all the love and luxury of the world; love so strong that it causes those who love father and mother more than all else to sacrifice that love unto the love of Christ; love so holy that, while it claims the whole heart, it yet makes the love for father and mother greater than it was before.

For the love of God does not destroy rightful love, but increases it and hallows it. The love of a woman for her husband does not lessen her love for her mother, but rather intensifies it. And so the love of the maiden for Christ, to whom she consecrates her heart and her life, serves to intensify her love for her dear ones. But for Christ's sake, to give him proof of her love, she withdraws from what she loves most on earth. These, therefore, are the noble souls who embrace the religious life; these are they who enter the convent. The call having come to them, they respond. Those who enter are the flower of maidenhood.

Some people think that those who renounce the world and family ties are heartless, but, on the contrary, it is because they have such great heart that they enter the convent. It is usually the most loving daughter that obeys the call to the religious life. You would not say that a girl had no heart because she leaves father and mother to get married and lives in a place far away from her parents. If the love for a man can make a girl suffer a separation

like that, how much more should the love of Christ do it!

Those who enter are of the same clay as others. They have the same human nature with its passions and inclinations, its virtues and defects. But feeling called to a higher life, they aim at curbing passion and cultivating virtue in a life devoted to service and sacrifice for Christ's sake. With Him as their model and leader they endeavor to become more and more like Him on earth that they may be closer to Him for eternity. They have received from Him the invitation to draw near. Souls chosen from the multitude, they step out from the ranks of the great Christian army and take their place close to Christ, the King, to serve by His side.

Father Scott's book will be the standard work in English on the religious life. It should find its way into other languages. It will be useful to young people who have not yet decided their vocation; to religious who have already chosen the better part, because it will remind them of the motives which should guide them and sustain them; to the Catholic laity, who ought to know the meaning of the religious life and be able to explain it to others; and to non-Catholics who want to know the truth and who will be edified by the lives of these choice children of the Church.

(To be continued.)

"A History of the United States." By John P. O'Hara. 12 mo., pp. 461. New York: The Macmillan Company.

"This volume aims to present the story of American history in a form which will engage the interest of pupils in the upper grades of the elementary schools. It will be found that a considerable amount of material of traditional interest, but of small intrinsic importance, has been omitted in order that a fuller emphasis might be placed on events and movements of greater significance. Following the best teaching opinion, the volume deals constantly with the casual relations of historical events, due regard being had for the capacity of the pupils who will use the book. The wealth of illustrations and the many excellent maps with which the volume is equipped greatly enhance its value for school use."

This announcement indicates very clearly the purpose of this volume, and when we say that the author has carried out his purpose faithfully and skilfully, we feel that he will be satisfied, because that is high praise.

History is a difficult field at best. The gathering of material, the sifting of authorities, the reconciling of contradictions, the drawing of correct conclusions from many and conflicting premises—all render the way of the historian a hard one. To do all this in brief form

is still harder, and therefore to produce a brief, complete, clear, truthful history of the United States in a volume of less than five hundred pages is a task which might discourage even those best fitted for it, and is an achievement of which even a scholar may be proud.

We may, therefore, congratulate the author on the excellence of his work. The outline illustrations are artistic and interesting, the maps are helpful, and the class questions at the end of each chapter are searching and stimulating.

"The Theistic Social Ideal or the Distributive State." By Rev. Patrick Casey, M. A., professor of sociology. 12 mo., pp. 68; pamphlet form. Milwaukee: Diederich-Schaefer Company.

The author thus defines the Distributive State: "When society is so economically adjusted that at least the majority of the citizens of any given community possess individuality and exercise control severally over a 'useful' and adequate amount of the 'means of production,' so that the whole community bears the stamp of the diffusion of wealth. Such a society, by reason of its economic foundation, is termed the *Distributive State*."

By a useful and adequate amount of "the means of production" is meant such a sufficiency of the said means as will by reason of their productive capacity guarantee an individual, his wife and family, a decent livelihood, plus a surplus to tide the family over financial panics and industrial crises.

Now that all sounds very clear and seems very simple. It is no new doctrine, nor will any one refuse to subscribe to it, and yet the millennium has not arrived. For who shall say what is a "decent livelihood," and who will decide what is a sufficient "surplus" to provide for the future? As long as men expect to find true happiness in this life, and do not believe that they have not here a lasting city, but must tend to one that is beyond; as long as they refuse to believe that man's life on earth is a warfare in which many contending forces struggle constantly; as long as they will not acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being on whom they depend and to whom they must render an account, they will be dissatisfied. They will give way to inordinate desires, and they will use unscrupulous means to gratify them. They will be torn by envy and jealousy, with all the attendant evils that follow in the wake of these passions.

We can never settle the affairs of men until we take into consideration the nature of man, the end of man, the obstacles in the way of his attaining that end, and the adequate means that must be used to surmount those obstacles.

In other words, we cannot settle the affairs of men if we leave

God out, and that is exactly what most persons are trying to do at this moment. It cannot be done. It has been remarked that the name of God has been studiously avoided in the transactions of the Congress of Nations which has formed a League that is to bring peace to the world and end war for all time. These same modern wise men refused to declare for liberty of conscience and worship, notwithstanding the fact that the greatest wars of all times have been fought for these principles, and will be fought in the future; and when we say greatest, we do not necessarily mean biggest, because bigness does not always include greatness.

Those who know the truth should never modify it or minimize it when discussing the affairs of men. It is good to consider the social, political and economic aspects of all such questions, but they can never be solved without due consideration of the religious element. Hence the value of this brochure by Father Casey. He says very truthfully: "Theism is the only system of philosophy which is compatible with any endeavor towards social reform. This is a proposition simple in its outline, clear in its meaning, conclusive in its import, yet around which has arisen such a Babel of confusion that at the very outset its incontrovertible truth must be inculcated and its precise import realized by every one who would work in the field of social endeavor."

The author closes by saying: "Our solution for current economic ills is a larger diffusion of wealth. We entirely reject by that solution any form of collectivism or Socialism. Socialism is that economic scheme which aims at greater concentration of wealth and consequently at a greater economic autocracy than the world has ever before experienced. Its programme is to place in the hands of social authority all the means of production. Its avowed object is to effect for society at large that self-contradictory thing, to give everybody everything by giving nobody anything."

"Catholic Home Annual," 1920. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This excellent publication with its wealth of useful information, its excellent fiction and its copious and beautiful illustrations, is worthy of a place in every Catholic family. If parents would supply books of this kind in larger number for their children in place of the secular magazines and current fiction, they would have the consolation of seeing them advance further in wisdom and grace as they advance in years.

In the current number we find an excellent summary of Monsignor Walsh's life of Joan of Arc; an interesting article on the feasts of the Church by Father Garesche, S. J., and an edifying instruction on the Fifteen Mysteries of the Rosary: all of these are

copiously illustrated. To these should be added a charming article on Subiaco, the Cradle of the Benedictine Order, by Rev. Michael Ott, O. S. B., with beautiful illustrations. And then there is excellent fiction by Mary T. Waggaman and others, and a sprinkling of poetry to complete the literary feast. The publishers are to be congratulated on the excellence of this number of a publication with a long and honorable history.

"The Government of Religious Communities." A Commentary on the Three Chapters of the Code of Canon Law. Preceded by a Commentary on the Establishment and Suppression of Religious Communities. By Hector Papi, S. J., author of "Religious Profession," professor of canon law, Woodstock College. 12 mo., pp. 200. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons.

When Dr. Papi's work on "Religious Profession" appeared, we were not alone in wishing that he would be able to give us commentaries on other parts of the New Code. At that time he expressed his intention of publishing a treatise on "Religious Vows." Since then he decided to bring out first a commentary on a very practical part of the Code dealing with religious, and therefore the main subject of this publication is "The Government of Religious Communities." We are not surprised to learn that the author received many requests from various sources for this treatise. It is of great practical value, and the masterly manner in which Dr. Papi does the work leaves nothing to be desired. When he has finished, the subject is exhausted, and all who are interested can act intelligently and safely.

In order to make the treatise more complete, in addition to the main subject taken from the Tenth Title of the Second Book of the Code, the author has included the Title on "The Establishment and Suppression of Religious Communities," which precedes Title Ten, and by a preliminary on "Religious Communities and Their Members," by which the Code opens this part on religious. The two chapters that will attract most attention in this book are probably those treating of "Superiors and Chapters" and "Confessors and Chaplains." In the first we find a clear explanation of the law which concerns superiors so much at present in regard to their changes every three or six years; in the second, we learn fully the wishes of the Church concerning the confessors of religious, a very far-reaching question. We hope that the learned author will continue these commentaries. They are so necessary, and he does them so well that if it were not impudent or presumptuous, we should be tempted to say it is his duty to do so.

"Ireland's Fairy Lore." By Rev. Michael P. Mahon. 12 mo., pp. 219. Boston: Thomas J. Flynn Company.

The chapters of this book appeared first in the Boston "Pilot"

during 1910 and 1911 as a series of papers on "Ancient Irish Paganism," but that does not detract from their interest in book-form, because they will now come into the hands of many who have not seen them before, and they are well worth while preserving in permanent form. They are interesting, amusing and scholarly.

Who is not interested in fairies? Surely no one of Irish birth or ancestry. They have existed in every nation from time immemorial, but Ireland seems to have been their true home in all ages. We can remember sitting around the fire in the days of our childhood listening in open-mouthed wonder to tales of these mysterious beings. We can recall our intense delight when the first book of fairy-tales came into our hands, and we were able to devour it. Nor did it furnish one feast only, for we returned to it again and with ever-growing appetite. And then we can go back to our first and long-expected visit to fairyland, to Ireland itself, where not the least of our joys was the hope that we might meet the little people face to face, or at least meet some intimate friends of them who had held close converse with them. But alas! and alas! the nearer we got to the fairies the farther away from them we seemed to be. When we were children, we often met persons who had heard the fairies or who had seen the effect of their work, or had known others who had known them, and the evidence was most convincing to us; but when we got closer and inquired more particularly, we found that the fairies had somewhat changed their mode of life, or had become more retired and less active. Nor were those who came in contact with them nearly so numerous as we expected. The first night we spent in Ireland we had to drive eleven miles along the seashore and through the country to reach our destination. As we took our places on the jaunting car and began our peaceful journey over the smooth roads for which Ireland is noted, lighted by a full autumn moon, it was almost midnight. All the fairy-lore of our childhood came back to us with a rush! Now, we said, everything is propitious. We watched and listened with all our eyes and ears, and although we heard many strange sounds and saw many odd forms in the shadows, we fear that our senses were not properly attuned, for the little people did not invite us to their feasts, their sports and their homes.

Now that is exactly what this book is for—to attune its readers so that they will be able to understand these mysterious beings and recognize them—when they see them. It is very interesting and very complete. It shows extensive research. The author is thoroughly in sympathy with his subject. It is admirably written, and those who wish to study the subject or be amused for an hour or two cannot afford to pass it by.

